Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernlanguagere10modeuoft

66
506
1
471

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUME X

1915

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET

Paris: LIBRAIRIE HACHETTE ET Cie.
Chicago: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LITERATURE AND PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MACAULAY

AND

J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY

VOLUME X

139081
12/7/16

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1915

PB
1
M65
v.10

CONTENTS

ARTICLES. PAGE

BELL, ALEXANDER, Cynewulf and Cyneheard in Gaimar . . . 42
BELL, AUBREY F. G., The 'Cantigas de Santa Maria' of Alfonso X. 338
BLOCK, K. S., Some Notes on the Problem of the 'Ludus Coventriæ' . 47
BRETT, CYRIL, Notes on 'Cleanness' and 'Sir Gawayne' . . . 188
CARPENTER, J. C., The Abbé Prévost and Shakespeare . . . 196
CHAMBERS, R. W., The 'Shifted Leaf' in 'Beowulf' 37
CLARK, RUTH, Walpole and the 'Mémoires de Grammont' . . 58
COLLINSON, W. E., The Irrational Negative in Concessive Sentences: A Study in Germanic Syntax 349
COOK, ALBERT S., The Date of the Old English Inscription on the Brussels Cross 157
FORBES, M. D., and DICKINS, BRUCE, The Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses 28
GRAY, HENRY DAVID, The First Quarto 'Hamlet' 171
GUTHKELCH, A. C., Swift's 'Tale of a Tub' V, VI 181
JONES, P. M., Whitman in France 1
KASTNER, L. E., Georg Rudolf Weckherlin's Models 366
LOOMIS, ROGER S., A Sidelight on the 'Tristan' of Thomas . . 304
POPE, MILDRED K., Four 'Chansons de Geste': A Study in Old French Versification 310
PRIEBSCH, ROBERT, Deutsche Prosafragmente des XII Jahrhunderts, I 203
SHAW, J. E., Dante's 'Gentile Donna'. 129, 320
SMITH, G. C. MOORE, The Parnassus Plays 162
TATLOCK, JOHN S. P., The Welsh 'Troilus and Cressida' and its Relation to the Elizabethan Drama 265
TOYNBEE, PAGET, Dante's Letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII): Critical Text 64
TOYNBEE, PAGET, Dante's Letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (*Epist.* V): Critical Text 150
TRENERY, GRACE R., Ballad Collections of the Eighteenth Century . 283
TROFIMOV, M. V., The Beginnings of Russian Literature . . . 73

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

ALDEN, RAYMOND MACDONALD, Two Exits in 'Othello' . . . 375
BELL, AUBREY F. G., Two Passages in the 'Cancioneiro da Vaticana' . 93
BRETT-SMITH, H. F. B., A Crux in the Text of Donne . . . 86
CHICANOT, E. L., The Polyglot Vernacular of the Canadian North-West 88

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES *cont.* PAGE

Classen, Ernest, O.E. 'Nicras' ('Beowulf,' 422, 575, 845, 1427) . 85
Emerson, Oliver Farrar, A Note on the M.E. 'Cleanness' . . 373
Graves, T. S., A Neglected Work of Pre-Restoration Criticism . 377
Lancaster, H. Carrington, Two Unnoticed Poems probably written by Pierre Corneille 226
Macaulay, G. C., 'A Dry Beating' 224
Macaulay, G. C., Shakespeare 'Romeo and Juliet,' II, ii, 38 ff. . 223
Martin, L. C., Crashaw's Translation of Marino's 'La Strage degli Innocenti' ('Sospetto d'Herode') 378
Mawer, Allen, 'Merril's Bridge'. 84
Smith, G. C. Moore, 'Jacke Jugeler,' ll. 256–259 375
Smith, G. C. Moore, Thackeray's 'Peg of Limavaddy' . . . 380
Swaen, A. E. H., The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus . . . 222
Tuttle, Edwin H., Catalan Notes 89
Williams, W. H., Marlowe and Lucian 222

REVIEWS.

Andeli, Henri d', The Battle of the Seven Arts, ed. by L. J. Paetow (André Barbier) 244
Barnouw, A. J., Anglo-Saxon Christian Poetry (A. R. Skemp) . . 109
Beaumont, F., and Fletcher, J., The Works of, ed. by A. Glover and A. R. Waller (G. C. Macaulay) 112
Beowulf, transl. by J. R. Clark Hall (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . 387
Bickley, F., The Life of Matthew Prior (A. C. Guthkelch) . . 232
Browning, R., Sordello, ed. by A. J. Whyte (C. H. Herford) . . 234
Brüll, H., Untergegangene und veraltete Worte des Französischen im heutigen Englisch (Louis Brandin) 118
Cowl, R. P., The Theory of Poetry in England (C. H. Herford) . 381
Duriez, G., La Théologie dans le Drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge (L. A. Triebel) 120
Duriez, G., Les Apocryphes dans le Drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge (L. A. Triebel) 120
Fansler, H. E., The Evolution of Technic in Elizabethan Tragedy (O. L. Hatcher) 382
Goodall, A., Place-Names of South-West Yorkshire (Allen Mawer) . 106
Hubschmied, J. U., Zur Bildung des Imperfekts im Frankoprovenzalischen (Edwin H. Tuttle) 246
Keynes, G., Bibliography of the Works of Donne (G. C. Moore Smith). 385
Lees, John, The German Lyric (F. E. Sandbach) 255
MacDonagh, Thomas, Thomas Campion and the Art of English Poetry (Raymond M. Alden) 231
Meredith, G., Poetical Works, ed. by G. M. Trevelyan (Helen Darbishire) 115
Middle English Humorous Tales in Verse, ed. by G. H. McKnight (J. W. H. Atkins) 237
Müller, Engelbert, Englische Lautlehre nach James Elphinston (H. Cecil Wyld) 109
Photiadès, C., George Meredith, transl. by A. Price (A. R. Skemp) . 236

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Prestage, E., D. Francisco Manuel de Mello (Aubrey F. G. Bell) . 119
Roberts, R. G., The Place-Names of Sussex 238
Sannazaro, Jacopo, The Piscatory Eclogues, ed. by W. P. Mustard (C. Foligno) 248
Schenck, E. M., La Part de Ch. Nodier dans la Formation des Idées romantiques de V. Hugo (André Barbier) 242
Schmidt, J., Shakespeares Dramen und sein Schauspielerberuf . . 228
Shakespeare's Macbeth, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson (G. C. Moore Smith) . 383
Spenser, E., The Poetical Works of, ed. by J. C. Smith and E. de Sélincourt (G. C. Macaulay) 111
Waterhouse, G., The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century (L. A. Willoughby) 122
Wyld, H. C., A Short History of English (Allen Mawer) 385

MINOR NOTICES.

Blake, W., Poetical Works of, ed. by J. Sampson 390
Boecker, A., A Probable Italian Source of Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar' 127
Eliot, George, Romola (The World's Classics) 390
Galt, John, The Entail (The World's Classics) 390
Hoare, A., An Italian Dictionary 391
Macaulay, Mr G. C. 392
Medicina de Quadrupedibus, ed. by J. Delcourt 128
Ritchie, R. L. G., and Moore, J. M., Manual of French Composition . 391
Smith, Russell, Harrington and his 'Oceana' 127

NEW PUBLICATIONS 258

WHITMAN IN FRANCE.

I.

A superficial knowledge of two types of literature so apparently dissimilar as Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and the poetry of the French Symbolists might point to the conclusion that no task could be more futile than the attempt to compare the two. It has been said of the *Leaves* that no such dose of realism and individualism under the guise of poetry, no such break with literary traditions—no such audacious attempt to tally in a printed page the living, concrete man, an actual human presence, instead of the conscious, made-up poet—can be found in modern literary records. When, in addition to this, it is affirmed that Whitman's poetry is almost entirely the expression of will and personality, and runs very little to intellectual subtleties and refinements, it might seem that no poetry is more remote from the abstract, cultivated, wilfully obscured lyricism of the Symbolists than Whitman's *Leaves*. Nevertheless, Whitman has been frequently linked with the Symbolists—chiefly, it is true, on account of similarities of poetical form—and in such a way as to suggest a possible influence of the American poet on his French contemporaries.

In studying this question, we have found that, in spite of fundamental dissimilarities, there are many striking resemblances between the new forms and ideas which throve on either side of the Atlantic during the second half of the last century. We have no reasons for thinking that there was any effective interaction between the two centres of inspiration at the birth of Symbolism. For although a few early Symbolists knew *Leaves of Grass* and even translated some of them into French, the force of Whitman's inspiration was not felt in France until the appearance of the complete version, *Les Feuilles d'Herbe*, in 1909. We can only account for this simultaneous realisation of similar ideals as the action of a vague but undeniable law which has been observed to operate again and again in the history of the

development of ideas. How often has it not been said that a great discovery is but the final and triumphant application of ideas that were already 'in the air'? Whitman seems to have been conscious of this fact when he wrote:

> This moment yearning and thoughtful sitting alone,
> It seems to me there are other men in other lands yearning and thoughtful,
> It seems to me I can look over and behold them in Germany, Italy, France, Spain,
> Or far, far away, in China, or in Russia or Japan, talking other dialects,
> And it seems to me if I could know those men I should become attached to them as I do to men in my own lands,
> O I know we should be brethren and lovers,
> I know I should be happy with them[1].

It is often said that there is a general form of sensibility which imposes itself upon all men of the same epoch. And in this sense M. Tancrède de Visan has written a study[2], 'proving without violence and by means of appropriate examples that Symbolism, far from being an exceptional literature, a production peculiar to the soil of France, and therefore a school, must be regarded as a general lyrical attitude in conformity with contemporary idealism.' Without aiming at a comprehensive definition, he says, 'Le symbolisme ou attitude poétique contemporaine se sert d'images successives ou accumulées pour extérioriser une intuition lyrique,' and quotes as an example, *Les Regards* from M. Maeterlinck's *Serres Chaudes*. In so far as it is an accumulation of successive images this poem was probably inspired by Whitman's 'catalogue' style. This does not mean that Whitman had any considerable influence on Symbolist art; for M. Maeterlinck's case is exceptional. But it may be pointed out that, broadly speaking, the above quoted definition of Symbolism is equally applicable to the poetry of Walt Whitman who begins his *Leaves* with an 'inscription' having for theme, 'eidólons' or 'images.'

> I met a seer,
> Passing the hues and objects of the world,
> The fields of art and learning, pleasure, sense,
> To glean eidólons.
>
> Put in thy chants, said he,
> No more the puzzling hour nor day, nor segments, parts, put in,
> Put first before the rest as light for all and entrance-song of all,
> That of eidólons[3].

[1] *Calamus*, *Leaves of Grass*, i, p. 154. Camden Book-lover's edition, edited by R. M. Bucke, T. B. Harned, H. L. Traubel. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
[2] *L'Attitude du Lyrisme contemporain*, Paris, 1911.
[3] *L. of G.*, i, p. 5.

The question of Whitman's influence on modern French poetry is closely allied to that of an equally intricate subject, the origin of the *vers libre* or modern French free verse. Whitman's poetry is remarkable from the standpoint of form in that it is devoid of rhyme and metre. It consists of rhythmical lines which vary in length and structure according to the poet's inspiration. That expression should correspond as closely as possible to inspiration is the essential principle of French free verse. Moreover, since Whitman was being translated into French in 1886 (a year before the appearance of the first *vers libres*) by Jules Laforgue, one of the originators of the new form, some writers have suggested that the *vers libre* was due primarily and directly to the influence of Whitman. This was not the case. Whitman's influence was neither deep nor broad enough to play any considerable part in the liberation of French prosody: this was essentially, if not entirely, a native development. Still, Whitman's influence is constantly (though, we think, erroneously) cited as explaining the origin of the *vers libre*, and this points at least to some similarity between the form of *Leaves of Grass* and that adopted by most French Symbolists.

Apart from the question of form, it might at first seem incongruous to suppose that there were any further similarities between Whitman's rhapsodic utterances, universal in their appeal, and the esoteric refinement of Symbolist poetry. And, indeed, in practice the resemblance is slight. Nevertheless, it is remarkable how many of the working ideas of the American poet and the Symbolists are identical. This was realised in France as early as 1892. In that year, the date of Whitman's death, a French critic of high standing, M. Teodor de Wyzewa, published a striking article in *La Revue Bleue* wherein he declared that all the innovations attempted in French literature during the preceding twenty-five years, could be found employed with more or less success in the first edition of *Leaves of Grass*. The object of M. de Wyzewa's study was however to disprove any influence exerted up to that time upon French literature by Whitman. The opposite point of view was taken by another French writer in 1904. This was M. Émile Blémont who wrote a 'postscriptum' to a new edition of an enthusiastic essay on Whitman first published in 1872. A poet of the old school, M. Blémont seems to suggest that the Symbolists did little but borrow from, and debase, Whitman's original inspiration. Though we find nothing to support this idea, these two essays furnish sufficient proof that marked resemblances exist between the work of Whitman and the Symbolists. These similarities may be briefly considered

from three standpoints: philosophic basis, poetical form and poetical theory.

Broadly speaking, Whitman resembles the Symbolists in being an idealist. After the tide of French realism had reached its high-water mark with the novels of the Naturalists, a wave of idealism swept over France and found its literary expression in the poetry of the Symbolists. The *Moi* was again enthroned as the sole and sovereign theme of poetry. Nor was this the joyous, irrepressible ego of the Romantic poets; but a personality taking account of itself amid the manifestations of a new age, and attuned to the marvels of the infinite and the infinitesimal as revealed by science. In expressing his most intimate self under these conditions, the poet often succeeded in animating the cold lessons of realism with the ardent inspirations of idealism.

Whitman has been described as an idealist who bound himself by a solemn vow to be a thorough-going realist. He was an idealist of the older, transcendental type,

> Kant having studied and stated, Fichte and Schelling and Hegel[1].

He has all the boisterous buoyancy of the Romanticists, yet, as he came later, he had a scientific outlook which they lacked and which makes him cry 'Hurrah for positive science.'

> I accept Reality and dare not question it,
> Materialism first and last imbuing[2].

Yet he recognises the limits of the scientists and passes beyond:

> Your facts are useful, and yet they are not my dwelling,
> I but enter by them to an area of my dwelling[3].

Like the Symbolists, Whitman was an idealist: he also resembled them in his fondness for mysticism and for oriental literature. 'In the instinctive operations of his mind,' writes Bliss Perry, 'he was a Mystic... In his capacity for brooding imaginative ecstasy he was Oriental rather than Western[4].' Enamoured of mystery and the infinite, the young poets of the Symbolist school sought the unknown wherever they thought it lay concealed. And if their feverish search for mystery has little in common with Whitman's quiet penetrating glance, a broader conception of the Symbolist movement will be found to reveal a closer parallel.

[1] *Calamus*, *Leaves of Grass*, i, p. 146. [2] *Inscriptions*, *Leaves of Grass*, i, p. 61.
[3] *Ibid.* [4] *Walt Whitman*, London, Boston and New York, 1906, p. 276.

Remembering that Whitman's sovereign theme was

> life immense in passion, pulse, and power,
> Cheerful, for freest action form'd under the laws divine[1],

we are struck by the fact that M. Francis Vielé-Griffin makes the Symbolist programme equally comprehensive: 'Ce qui caractérise le symbolisme, c'est la passion du mouvement au geste infini, de la Vie même, joyeuse ou triste, belle de toute la multiplicité de ses métamorphoses, passion agile et protéenne qui se confond avec les heures du jour et de la nuit, perpétuellement renouvelée, intarissable et diverse comme l'onde et le feu, riche du lyrisme éternel, prodigue comme la terre puissante, profonde et voluptueuse comme le Mystère[2].' The similarity between these two ideals has also struck a French poet who was one of the first in his country to be influenced by the American poet. In a recent article, M. Philéas Lebesque wrote: 'Si le symbolisme avait compris dès le début sa propre grandeur il y a beau temps que le Barde de Manhattan aurait dû être revendiqué comme précurseur[3].' It has already been said that Whitman and the *verslibristes* have so much in common that a few French writers have suggested the indebtedness of the latter to the former for many technical innovations. This question would require special treatment. For the present we shall attempt to note a few principles common to the work of Whitman and of the French Symbolists—principles which occasion the resemblances that have been mistaken for borrowings.

Like all modern poets, Whitman and the Symbolists recognise the lyric as the only possible form of poetic expression. One of the greatest of foreign influences exerted on *Symbolisme* was that of another American poet, Edgar Allan Poe. Both Baudelaire and Mallarmé translated Poe's poetry which they loved for its elusive music and alluring morbidity. His essays provided them with certain principles of poetic taste among which may be mentioned their predilection for the short poem. Whitman also knew Poe. In some of his later poems there is a strain of delicate melancholy, which may be due to this acquaintance. Yet the robust optimism of *Leaves of Grass* is diametrically opposed to the morbid tendencies of Poe, Baudelaire, Mallarmé and his school. And some of Whitman's remarks concerning the American model of the Symbolists emphasise this difference between the French poets and himself. In his last piece of self-criticism, *A Backward Glance o'er Travel'd Roads*, Whitman writes,

[1] *L. of G.*, i, p. 1. [2] *Mercure de France*, Oct. 1895. [3] *La Phalange*, 15 juin 1908.

'Toward the last I had among much else look'd over Edgar Poe's poems—of which I was not an admirer, tho' I always saw that beyond their limited range of melody (like perpetual chimes of music bells, ringing from lower *b* flat up to *g*) they were melodious expressions, and perhaps never excelled ones, of certain pronounc'd phases of human morbidity. (The Poetic area is very spacious—has room for all—has so many mansions!) But I was repaid in Poe's prose by the idea that (at any rate for our occasions, our day) there can be no such thing as a long poem. The same thought had been haunting my mind before, but Poe's argument, though short, work'd the sum and proved it to me[1].'

Without employing a fixed stanza, both Whitman and the *vers-libristes* wrote in paragraphs, grouping together lines of varying lengths irrespective of any prearranged plan and in obedience only to their personal inspiration. Here is a passage from M. Verhaeren:

> Son or ailé qui s'enivre d'espace,
> Son or planant, son or rapace,
> Son or vivant,
> Son or dont s'éclairent et rayonnent les vents,
> Son or que boit la terre,
> Par les pores de sa misère,
> Son or ardent, son or furtif, son or retors,
> Morceau d'espoir et de soleil—son or[2]!

And here is one from Whitman:

> The main shapes arise!
> Shapes of Democracy total, result of centuries,
> Shapes ever projecting other shapes,
> Shapes of turbulent manly cities,
> Shapes of the friends and home-givers of the whole earth,
> Shapes bracing the earth and braced with the whole earth[3].

Underlying this freedom of structure is a common instinct for music in poetry. In emphasising the musical rather than the pictorial effects of verse, Whitman broke with his more formal predecessors just as the young poets of the eighties did in France. For no distinction between Parnassians and Symbolists is more fundamental than this, that while the former conceived of poetry as allied to painting and sculpture, to the Symbolists music was the handmaid of poetry. Their ideal was to wed poetry to music more intimately than had ever been done before. Verlaine appealed for 'la musique avant toute chose,' and it is music that supplied them with the rhythms and even the diction

[1] *Leaves of Grass*, iii, p. 56.
[2] *Le Banquier, Les Forces tumultueuses* (Paris, 1902), p. 49.
[3] *Song of the Broad-Axe*, *L. of G.*, i, p. 237.

of poetry. They tried to effect in the poetry of their day a revolution analogous to that achieved by Wagner whose operas were their most powerful models of the use of Symbolism, and the liberation of form, in music.

Through Wagner, as through Poe, the Symbolists are again connected with Whitman who, though he knew little of the later movement that came through Wagner, once told his friends: 'I know from the way you fellows talk of it, that the music of Wagner is the music of the *Leaves*[1].' Whitman frequently admitted his indebtedness to music for suggesting rhythmical variations. During the gestation of his poems, he was saturated for years with the rendering by the best vocalists and performers of operas and oratorios. On one occasion he remarked, 'with as much sincerity as geniality that it would indeed be strange if there were no music at the heart of his poems, for more of these were actually inspired by music than he himself could mention[2].' The rich rugged rhythm and interior music of the *Leaves* are evident in such a passage as this:

> Proud music of the storm,
> Blast that careers so free, whistling across the prairies,
> Strong hum of forest tree-tops—wind of the mountains,
> Personified dim shapes—you hidden orchestras,
> You serenades of phantoms with instruments alert,
> Blending with Nature's rhythmus all the tongues of nations;
> You chords left as by vast composers—you choruses,
> You formless, free religious dances—you from the Orient,
> You undertone of rivers, roar of pouring cataracts,
> You sounds from distant guns with galloping cavalry,
> Echoes of camps with all the different bugle-calls,
> Trooping tumultuous, filling the midnight late, bending me powerless,
> Entering my lonesome slumber-chamber, why have you seiz'd me[3]?

Another trait common to Whitman and the Symbolists is their confusion of the forms of poetry and prose in the attempt to mould a subtler and more intimate medium of poetic expression. Even in Mallarmé, the father of French Symbolists, this tendency is evident. 'Le vers est partout dans la langue où il y a rhythme,' he writes, 'partout excepté dans les affiches et à la quatrième page des journaux. Dans le genre appelé prose, il y a des vers, quelquefois admirables, de tous rhythmes. Mais en vérité il n'y a pas de prose; il y a l'alphabet, et puis des vers plus ou moins serrés, plus ou moins diffus. Toutes les fois qu'il y a effort ou style, il y a versification[4].'

Whitman has dealt at length with the need which the modern poet must feel for utmost freedom of expression. And though his object,

[1] *L. of G.*, i, p. xxxiii.
[2] See R. M. Bucke, *Walt Whitman*, p. 156.
[3] *L. of G.*, ii, p. 178.
[4] Jules Huret, *L'Enquête sur l'évolution littéraire*, p. 60.

which is to celebrate not only the intricacies of modern thought but all the mechanical manifestations of our age, scarcely resembles that of the Symbolists who too often aimed only at expressing the niceties of their own refined natures, the means Whitman proposes to adopt in effacing the distinction between poetry and prose are identical with those practised by the French poets. 'In my opinion,' he writes, 'the time has arrived to essentially break down the barriers of form between prose and poetry. I say the latter is henceforth to win and maintain its character regardless of rhyme, and the measurement-rules of iambic, spondee, dactyl, etc., and that.....the truest and greatest *Poetry* (while subtly and necessarily always rhythmic, and distinguishable easily enough) can never again, in the English language, be express'd in arbitrary and rhyming metre, any more than the greatest eloquence, or the truest power and passion. While admitting that the venerable and heavenly forms of chiming versification have in their time play'd great and fitting parts.....it is, notwithstanding, certain to me that the day of such conventional rhyme is ended.' He adds that the poetry of the future 'adapting itself to comprehend the size of the whole people, with the free play, emotions, pride, passions, experiences, that belong to them, body and soul—to the general globe, and all its relations in astronomy as the *savans* portray them to us—to the modern, the busy nineteenth century (as grandly poetic as any, only different) with steamships, railroads, factories, electric telegraphs, cylinder presses —to the thought of the solidarity of nations, the brotherhood and sisterhood of the entire earth—to the dignity and heroism of the practical labor of farms, factories, foundries, workshops, mines, or on shipboard, or on lakes and rivers—resumes that other medium of expression, more flexible, more eligible—soars to the freer, vast, diviner heaven of prose[1].' How strikingly this passage compares with the famous preface to *Les petits poèmes en prose* in which Charles Baudelaire, a forerunner of the Symbolists, voices the desire for a new, more supple poetical form: 'Quel est celui de nous qui n'a pas, dans ses jours d'ambition, rêvé le miracle d'une prose poétique, musicale sans rhythme et sans rime, assez souple et assez heurtée pour s'adapter aux mouvements lyriques de l'âme, aux ondulations de la rêverie, aux soubresauts de la conscience? C'est surtout de la fréquentation des villes énormes, c'est du croisement de leurs innombrables rapports que naît cet idéal obsédant.'

[1] *New Poetry*, *Complete Prose Works*, Camden Book-lover's edition, ii, pp. 272 f.

Whitman's criticism of rhyme is significant. The argument that rhyme produces a comic effect is one often used against it by partisans of the *vers libre*. The *verslibristes* themselves started by weakening the rhyme-endings, and paying less attention to this feature of the verse, which had been so important for the Parnassians[1]. In his *Art poétique*, a sacred text for the Symbolists, Paul Verlaine writes:

Tu feras bien, en train d'énergie
De rendre un peu la Rime assagie,
Si l'on n'y veille, elle ira jusqu'où?

Oh! qui dira les torts de la Rime!
Quel enfant sourd ou quel nègre fou
Nous a forgé ce bijou d'un sou
Qui sonne creux et faux sous la lime?

And again (*Art poétique*):

Car nous voulons la Nuance encor,
Pas la Couleur, rien que la nuance!
Oh! la nuance seule fiance
Le rêve au rêve et la flûte au cor.

Half-tints, music, fading prospects and deliberate indefiniteness are eminently characteristic of Symbolist poetry to which we might apply Whitman's description of his own poetry: 'The boundless vista and the horizon far and dim are all here.' Allied to the extensive use of allegory, these effects naturally lead to obscurity. The charge of obscurity is one of the most frequent made against these poets, who say with Whitman,

Here I shade and hide my thoughts, I myself do not expose them[2].

They reply to this charge much in the terms of his justification of the same supposed defect in *Leaves of Grass*. 'In certain parts of these flights...,' he says, 'I have not been afraid of the charge of obscurity,... because human thought, poetry or melody, must leave dim escapes and outlets,—must possess a certain fluid aerial character, akin to space itself, obscure to those of little or no imagination, but indispensable to the highest purposes. *Poetic style, when address'd to the soul, is less definite form, outline, sculpture, and becomes vista, music, half-tints, and even less than half-tints.* True, it may be architecture; but again it may be the forest wildwood, or the best effect thereof, at twilight, the waving oaks and cedars in the wind, and the impalpable odor[3].'

These last remarks, laying stress on 'the best effect' of the forest, 'the waving oaks' and 'impalpable odor,' remind one of the famous

[1] See Théodore de Banville, *Petit Traité de Versification française*.
[2] *Calamus, L. of G.*, i, p. 156.
[3] *Preface*, 1876, to *L. of G. and Two Rivulets, Complete Prose Works*, ii, pp. 202 f.

dictum of Mallarmé: 'Abolie, la prétention...d'inclure au papier subtil du volume autre chose que par exemple l'horreur de la forêt, ou le tonnerre muet épars au feuillage: non le bois intrinsèque et dense des arbres[1].' This goes to the roots of Symbolist poetry, which aims at suggesting, not describing. 'Nommer un objet,' says Mallarmé, 'c'est supprimer les trois quarts de la jouissance du poème qui est faite du bonheur de deviner peu à peu; le suggérer, voilà le rêve[2].' 'For us,' says Whitman, quoting Sainte-Beuve, 'the greatest poet is he who in his works most stimulates the reader's imagination and reflection, who excites him the most himself to poetize. The greatest poet is not he who has done the best; it is he who suggests the most; he, not all of whose meaning is at first obvious, and who leaves you much to desire, to explain, to study, much to complete in your turn[3].' In thus citing the great French critic whose writings have been shown to contain many of the germs of the later poetic movement, Whitman anticipates one of the fondest ideals of the Symbolists. He says elsewhere:

> The words of the true poems give you more than poems,
> They give you to form for yourself poems...[4].

He goes a step further and realises that all the poet can do is to suggest: 'The best poetic utterance, after all, can merely hint, or remind, often very indirectly, or at distant removes. Aught of real perfection, or the solution of any deep problem, or any completed statement of the moral, the true, the beautiful, eludes the greatest, deftest poet—flies away like an always uncaught bird[5].' He constantly reminds his reader that he would appeal to him 'as much by indirections as by directions.' As for the *Leaves*, 'The word I myself put primarily for the description of them as they stand at last,' says their author, 'is the word Suggestiveness[6].'

More than is the case with any other poet, Whitman's greatest value is in what he implies rather than in what he portrays. Nowhere are the devices of symbol and suggestion oftener used than in *Calamus*, where he says,

> For it is not for what I have put into it that I have written this book,
> Nor is it by reading it you will acquire it....
> For all is useless without that which you may guess at many times and not hit, that which I hinted at[7].

[1] *Vers et Prose*, pp. 184 f.
[2] Jules Huret, *L'Enquête sur l'évolution littéraire*, p. 60.
[3] *Complete Prose Works*, ii, p. 217.
[4] *L. of G.*, i, p. 205.
[5] *Complete Prose Works*, iii, p. 127.
[6] *A Backward Glance o'er Travel'd Roads*, *L. of G.*, iii, p. 58.
[7] *L. of G.*, i, p. 141.

Many of Whitman's poems are symbols[1], and none is so typical as this gem which emits the varying rays of a series of images, symbolising his songs:

> Roots and leaves themselves alone are these,
> Scents brought to men and women from the wild woods and pond-side,
> Breast-sorrel and pinks of love, fingers that wind around tighter than vines,
> Gushes from the throats of birds hid in the foliage of trees as the sun is risen,
> Breezes of land and love sent from living shores to you on the living sea, to you O sailors!
> Frost-mellow'd berries and Third-month twigs offer'd to young persons wandering out in the fields when the winter breaks up,
> Love-buds put before you and within you wherever you are,
> Buds to be unfolded on the old terms,
> If you bring the warmth of the sun to them, they will open and bring form, colour, perfume to you,
> If you become the aliment and the wet they will become flowers, fruits, tall branches and trees[2].

The adoption of a suggestive mode of expression was not a pose on the part of the Symbolists, but reveals the presence of a lofty ideal—that of attempting a synthesis of life. Life to them was something so immense, so varied, yet so evasive as to be incapable of direct or descriptive treatment: it could only be suggested symbolically. Far from neglecting life, the Symbolists plumbed the depths of their own souls to seek communion with the ultimate Reality. 'La réforme prosodique, la façon de concevoir le lyrisme, l'évolution d'une poésie plus intériorisée, plus proche de l'âme des choses, plus palpitante, plus idéaliste, c'est-à-dire plus immanente au réel, plus intuitive, n'ont tendu qu'à une plus large compréhension de l'idée de vie, qu'à un art plus expressif, plus intensement dynamique[3].' This broad vision of life seems to combine in one supreme synthesis the Symbolist poets of France with the great American mystic:

> I will not make poems with reference to parts,
> But I will make poems, songs, thoughts, with reference to ensemble,
> And I will not sing with reference to a day, but with reference to all days,
> And I will not make a poem nor the least part of a poem but has reference to the soul,
> Because having look'd at the objects of the universe, I find there is no one nor any particle of one but has reference to the soul[4].

Whitman and the Symbolists have in common a general lyrical

[1] Whitman often uses a symbol consciously. In the *Song of the Banner at Daybreak* (*L. of G.*, ii, p. 46) he conceives of the poet as 'one carrying a symbol and menace far into the future.' And in one of his last poems *Death's Valley* (*L. of G.*, iii, p. 36) he claims his 'right to make a symbol too.'

[2] *L. of G.*, p. 149.

[3] M. Tancrède de Visan, *L'Attitude du lyrisme contemporain*, p. 12.

[4] *Starting from Paumanok*, *Leaves of Grass*, i, p. 25.

attitude which may be conceived of as being initiated by Whitman and fulfilled, to a greater or less degree, in the work of the French poets. It is remarkable how clearly Whitman saw the trend of the coming changes and how closely his ideals of the new poetry approximate to those of the Symbolists. 'The poetry of the future,' he writes in a passage which sums up all the tendencies of the recent movement, 'aims at the free expression of emotion (which means far, far more than appears at first) and to arouse and initiate, more than to define or finish. Like all modern tendencies, it has direct or indirect reference continually to the reader, to you or me, to the central identity of everything, the mighty Ego....It is more akin, likewise, to outside life and landscape (resuming mainly to the antique feeling), real sun and gale, and woods and shores—to the elements themselves—not sitting at ease in parlor or library listening to a good tale of them, told in good rhyme. Character, a feature far above style or polish—a feature not absent at any time but now first brought to the fore—gives predominant stamp to advancing poetry. Its born sister, music, already responds to the same influences...[1].'

To sum up, we see, then, that Whitman and the Symbolists had certain common sources; their idealism derives from German philosophy, their mysticism owes much to Eastern literatures. We have traced connections on both sides with Poe, Wagner and Sainte-Beuve. In the matter of form, the resemblances are closer. There is the same fear of fettering the inspiration, the same quest of a more adaptable, more personal medium free from the restraints of metre and possessing the flexibility of prose. Whitman and the Symbolists realised that the lyric was the only possible form for future poetry. They insisted upon the kinship of poetry and music; hence on the essential power of poetry to suggest. Unlike Whitman, the Symbolists were refined artists. Frequently, it must be admitted, they did not realise the high ideals of their numerous manifestos, and much of their poetry is precisely what Whitman would have abhorred, because it is a 'poésie d'élite.' Thus it is surprising that one or two of the most fanciful Symbolists, like Laforgue and M. Stuart Merrill, should have loved Whitman and even translated some of his poems; others had a more concrete view of life, which only links them the closer to Whitman, who was as much a realist as an idealist. M. Vielé-Griffin's more virile work is more akin to Whitman's; while the majesty and force of M. Émile Verhaeren's lyrico-epics make him a successful rival of Whitman as a singer of the

[1] *Complete Prose Works*, ii, p. 216.

modern world. Lastly, it must be remembered that it was the Symbolists who first introduced Whitman into France. And though he can scarcely be said to have had any influence on their work, we can perceive, in their ideals as well as at whiles in their poetry, the preparation for that whole-hearted appreciation which the work of Walt Whitman now receives in France.

II.

Although it is only since the publication of M. Léon Bazalgette's two works—*Whitman l'homme et son œuvre* (1908), and *Les Feuilles d'herbe* (1909)—that Whitman has become a force in French literature, he had nevertheless been known in France, to a small but increasing number of admirers, for over thirty years. Before the appearance of these two books, articles and translations had given a few French readers a foretaste of the first essentially American poetry. But, beside the fact that a knowledge of English was necessary for a true appreciation of Whitman's works, the works themselves were difficult to find, the most accessible edition being Mr W. M. Rossetti's selection, from which the sex poems are excluded. Gradually, however, the curiosity of the public was awakened. 'On nous interrogeait nous autres Whitmaniens,' writes M. Valéry Larbaud in an interesting article published in 1909, 'on nous demandait quel homme avait été ce Whitman, et on écoutait attentivement nos traductions orales. — Vincent Muselli pourrait témoigner que dès 1901–1902, dans une chambre d'étudiant, rue de la Sorbonne, quelques amis commémoraient, simplement mais avec dignité, la naissance et la mort du Poète de la Démocratie. Quels projets notre enthousiasme nous faisait faire alors! Je devais parler sur "Walt Whitman et la guerre de Sécession" dans une sorte de cercle populaire, à Grenelle (j'ai encore mes notes). Nous voulions proposer la vie de notre poète en exemple aux ouvriers! De tout cela rien ne sortit et l'article que je destinais à *La Plume* (et que son directeur a longtemps attendu) fut retardé de mois en mois par des circonstances indépendantes de ma volonté, jusqu'à la disparition de *La Plume*, et ne fut jamais achevé. Je crois bien que plusieurs articles et des traductions de nombreuses pièces des *Feuilles d'herbe* furent ainsi préparés, et ne virent jamais le jour, pour des motifs restés inexpliqués, ou plutôt par une sorte de fatalité singulière[1].'

[1] *La Phalange*, 20 Avril, 1909.

Such remarks show how precarious Whitman's position in France was at that time. He was saved from the dilettanti by the fact that those who knew English were scared at first glance by a poetry which sacrificed rules and conventions in the blunt endeavour to sing democracy. But during the last decade a public has been slowly prepared for Whitman in France. He has been discussed by those who are sensitive to true poetry. It has been said that a drawback to his widespread acceptation in France has been the attempt of certain political parties—especially anarchists—to claim Whitman as their supporter. A striking manifestation of this spirit is an article by Mme Elsie Masson entitled 'Walt Whitman, poète et ouvrier' which appeared in the *Mercure de France* for August, 1907: the good grey poet would have been amused to find himself described as 'ardemment révolutionnaire[1].' On the other hand, nothing but the true Whitman spirit could have inspired the series of public lectures which have disseminated Whitman's ideals among the common people with the object of giving them a poetry conceived and composed for the 'average man.'

Thus a study of Whitman in France necessitates a consideration of the translations made from his work, and of the essays, articles and lectures inspired by his poetry and the heroism of his life. Almost all the essays and articles contain translations of entire poems or fragments. But these renderings seldom reach the high artistic level of those made from time to time in French reviews since Jules Laforgue published his first translations from 'the amazing American poet' in *La Vogue* in the year 1886. Being the work of acknowledged poets like Laforgue and M. Vielé-Griffin who were in the flood of the contemporary movement, they are of much more significance than the few articles on Whitman which had appeared previously in French reviews. For this reason we feel obliged to treat them first.

In 1884 Léo Quesnel wrote in the *Revue politique et littéraire*: 'Whitman traduit n'est plus Whitman; la langue riche et libre qu'il a su se créer, grâce aux larges tolérances des idiomes anglo-saxons, ne saurait être coulée dans le moule étroit et pur des langues latines.'

[1] Whitman once said: 'My leanings are all towards the radicals: but I am not in any proper sense of the word a *révolutionnaire*.' H. Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, p. 193.

And Whitman himself said in reference to a translation which the French poet, M. Vielé-Griffin, proposed making: 'Let them make it—I encourage it: let results take care of themselves: but I do not think the French will take hold of me—that I come within their orbit[1].'

Neither of these opinions is now tenable. Like all geniuses of the first order, Whitman translated remains Whitman, even in French; it has even been alleged that what he loses in passing from one language to another, he gains in colour and clearness. Moreover it may be safely affirmed that the breadth and liberty of Whitman's verse enables it to escape the dangers of translation more readily than verses whose beauty is the result of regular metres or verbal music. The throb, the rhythm, the emotional force of the *Leaves* are qualities which reappear undiminished, and in certain cases intensified, in their foreign garb. As for Whitman's fears concerning the success of his work in France—fears felt before reading Gabriel Sarrazin's study, which must have changed his opinion—a glance at the articles written since the appearance of the French version shows his doubts to have been groundless.

The history of these early translations is difficult to unravel owing to the fact that many of the reviews in which they appeared—the reviews of the early Symbolist days—are now rare. But after a close study of private collections—for the most part incomplete—we have drawn up a tentative list of translations which we append to this study. The most important of early Symbolist reviews was *La Vogue*, the first number of which appeared on April 4, 1886, and contained contributions signed by Mallarmé, Verlaine, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, Rimbaud, Kahn. The earliest translation from Whitman appears in the tenth number and is entitled: 'M. Walt Whitman: Les Brins d'Herbe (Traduit de l'étonnant poète américain Walt Whitman, J.L.).' The translator was Jules Laforgue[2], the author of *Les Complaintes*, of *Moralités légendaires* and of *L'imitation de Notre-Dame la Lune.*

[1] Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, p. 153.

[2] The following ironical note appears in *Les Entretiens politiques et littéraires* for August, 1892:

'Comme peu de vos lecteurs auront suivi M. Masson dans son exploration dans "toutes les anciennes revues des deux premiers tiers du siècle," nous citons avec plaisir le résultat effectif de cet effort d'érudition:

"Puisque nous en sommes sur la littérature anglaise, je prendrai la liberté de révéler ...que Jules Laforgue n'est pas proprement le premier traducteur français du poète américain. Bien auparavant, à savoir dès 1861, M. Louis Etienne au cours du travail important, quoique peu admiratif, sur Walt Whitman, poète, philosophe, et rowdy, donnait dans la *Revue Européenne* (1er nov.) la traduction de plusieurs morceaux caractéristiques de *Leaves of Grass*."

L'intuition eut pu suffire à nous éviter une erreur regrettable en tous points: ce nom d'Etienne implique, en effet, un rhythme de primauté qui concorde, exactement, on le voit, avec le témoignage de la Science.'

Familiar with German thought and English poetry, eager in quest of new emotions and curious as to novel forms of art, Laforgue represented one of the most fruitful tendencies of the Symbolist generation—its readiness to acclimatise the great original masters of foreign art and literature. In this respect the association of the names of Whitman and Laforgue in the pages of a humble review supported by the meagre earnings of a group of young artists is a feature of special significance.

Laforgue knew of Whitman through the son of a general in the United States Army, M. Francis Vielé-Griffin, who is now considered, by many of his contemporaries, the most important of the French Symbolist poets. Born in America M. Vielé-Griffin knew Whitman's work at an early date and even visited the poet[1]. Subsequently he revealed the beauties of the *Leaves* to some of the younger French poets, including Laforgue. In 1888 M. Vielé-Griffin sent Whitman a letter accompanied by a presentation copy of *Les Cygnes*[2]. The letter pleased Whitman who sent his correspondent the most recent edition of the *Leaves*. It is to be regretted that M. Vielé-Griffin did not execute his project. An American by birth and a French poet of unquestionable talent, he seemed peculiarly fitted to carry out the enterprise vaguely adumbrated by Laforgue. Fragments of his original plan survive in some pieces scattered over the pages of reviews, and a rendering in alexandrines of 'When lilacs last in the dooryard bloom'd.' These are sufficient, however, to ensure M. Francis Vielé-Griffin's being remembered as one of the early admirers of the *Leaves*.

[1] See H. Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, p. 249.

[2]
15 quai de Bourbon,
Paris,
April 26th, 1888.

Sir and Dear Poet,

In admiration of some of your poems, which I read in an edition, ridiculously 'expurgated,' published by Chatto and Windus, in London, I feel constrained to have the Parisian people share the estimation in which I hold your high lyrical talent.

Would it be too much to ask of you that you indicate the volume (the edition) which you would prefer having rendered in the French? My friend, Jules Laforgue (who died only too prematurely) has already given to the public two of your poems, and the reception they met with seems to presage a new victory for your works.

In expectation of your kind reply, Sir and dear poet, permit me to assure you of my sympathy in art and of my profound admiration.

FRANCIS VIELÉ-GRIFFIN.

This translation is reproduced from H. Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, pp. 118, 119. On p. 124 we get a further interesting note: 'Took to Whitman, who came to the door himself, my father's translation of Griffin's letter. W. read it and was pleased. He remembered the Laforgue renderings in the French. "I never could have known how they were done, of course, as I have absolutely no conversancy with the language. You ought to see Laforgue's poems—I want to hunt them up for you—I have them here. I try to look at my face in a French glass but somehow it don't work very well. I shall advise Griffin to use one of the later editions—not to fool with the older books—yes, to use McKay's." '

The *Revue Indépendante* for November, 1888, published three translations from Whitman by M. Vielé-Griffin, who in 1890 founded a little review entitled *Les Entretiens politiques et littéraires.* It had a successful career and in November, 1892, published a translation by its founder entitled: 'Lectures poétiques: À quelque révolutionnaire d'Europe dans la défaite, par Walt Whitman.' Another translation from Whitman by M. Vielé-Griffin occurs in *L'Ermitage* for 1889. In the *Magasin International* (1891) Laurence Jerrold translated three of Whitman's poems. Then curiosity seems to have flickered out, until M. Henry D. Davray published translations from the *Leaves* in *La Plume* and *L'Ermitage* (1901–1903). In the latter review Louis Fabulet took up the work in 1904; the alternating translations of prose and verse published in these two reviews constitute the fullest homage paid to Walt Whitman in France before the appearance in 1909 of M. Léon Bazalgette's *Feuilles d'Herbe.* This complete version marks an important stage in the movement: it offers us, so to say, the culmination of these diverse, isolated efforts and partial revelations of the poetry of Walt Whitman[1].

Up to this time, as we have seen, the responses of France to the appeal of the *Leaves* were not only few and far between, but came from men different greatly in tendency and temperament. And how could it be otherwise since Whitman, untranslated except for a few snatches, scarcely read except by the three or four dozen who could understand him in the original, remained one of the great unknown? It was clear that this ignorance would continue as long as the bulk of his work was untranslated. Towards 1905 a few of the initiated knew that a change was at hand. At that date, one who for ten years had harboured the design of translating Whitman into French, set himself to the task. One resolve dominated his action from the beginning, namely, that his version should be complete and worthy of the poet. The time for pruning and expurgating the Barbarian of Manhattan was long past, and rather than mutilate him, it would be better to leave him entirely unknown. This was moreover the express desire of him who left this note among his papers: 'Put in a passage in some poem to the effect of denouncing and threatening whosoever translates my poems

[1] M. Bazalgette had prepared the way for his *Feuilles d'Herbe* by an excellent biography of Whitman from which we gather the following interesting detail. In discussing the fortunes of Whitman in foreign lands, he writes: 'Sur la terre de France, il trouvait également un admirateur fervent en la personne d'un descendant de Lucien Bonaparte, né en Irlande, Charles Bonaparte Wyse, qui...adaptait en provençal...quelques morceaux des *Feuilles d'herbe*' (*Walt Whitman, l'homme et son œuvre*, p. 307).

into any other tongue without translating *every line* and doing it all without increase or diminution[1].'

This point settled, another question arose. To present an unprepared public with a work so unusual, so contrary to current literary ideals as the *Leaves*, would almost certainly be to court failure, to do perhaps more harm than good to a work already misunderstood. Since Whitman had lived his poems before writing them it was incumbent first to sketch his portrait *de pied en cap*, to tell the great poem of his life, so as to lead the French reader gradually to the threshold of his work and finally to the appreciation of its strong strange qualities. M. Léon Bazalgette published his life of Whitman in 1908, and, the following year, a complete version of the *Leaves of Grass*, which, before that date, had been translated entirely in Italian alone. The second part of the undertaking, comprising, on one hand, the translation of *Specimen Days* and other prose works, and on the other an essay on the *Leaves* considered as a 'poème évangile,' is now not far from completion. When these last volumes appear France will be the first foreign nation to possess in her own tongue a complete Walt Whitman. M. Bazalgette's enthusiasm for Whitman has given him a remarkable insight into the true meaning of the American poet. His translations reveal a conscientious effort to avoid colouring the sense of the original by his own interpretation of it. His chief object has been, not to make a work of art, but to render the special qualities of the original as closely as possible. Thus he is the hierophant of Walt Whitman to the French, and as such he is acclaimed by those who are grateful enough to acknowledge the debt of vision they owe to him[2].

We have seen that the first French translations from Whitman appeared in 1886; but he was acknowledged in France long before that date. By a strange coincidence, as early as 1872, two important French reviews dealt with Whitman almost simultaneously. The *Revue des deux Mondes* for June 1 published an article by Mme Thérèse Bentzon entitled 'Un poète américain, Walt Whitman.' These pages are an involuntary confession of the writer's inability to understand her subject. Headed by the words 'Muscle and pluck for ever!' the article lays stress on the 'monstrosités' of Whitman's poetry. The writer makes the mistake of considering certain poems of the 'open road,'

[1] *Meaning and intention of 'Leaves of Grass,' Complete Prose Works*, vol. vi, p. 6.

[2] *Walt Whitman* by M. Henri Guilbeaux in *Portraits d'Hier*, No. 37, Sept. 15, 1910. 'Il importe dans une notice, si brève soit-elle, consacrée à Walt Whitman d'inscrire sur un bloc de granit le nom de Léon Bazalgette intimement lié au nom du grand poète des *Feuilles d'herbe*.'

like *Starting from Paumanok,* as pages from the poet's diary 'after roaming many lands,' instead of descriptions of imaginative wanderings. But her greatest error lies in making Whitman an incorrigible materialist[1]: she dubs him 'le poète de la matière.' Hopelessly misunderstanding his ethics, she declares: 'il n'y a point d'indécence qui le fasse reculer; la langue française se refuserait à la traduction de certains morceaux érotiques.' The article abounds in lengthy translations which are designed to give an idea of Whitman's form and style, the *defects* of which the writer rejoices that she is unable to reproduce! She cannot deny his work 'une certaine grandeur et beaucoup de passion'; but her attempt to do justice to the man is paralysed by her doubts as to his healthiness of mind. Yet the article is not wholly worthless. With equal justice she censures *Salut au monde* and commends *Drum Taps,* and concludes by proclaiming Longfellow the first of American poets 'n'en déplaise à M. Walt Whitman.'

Exactly a week after the publication of Madame Bentzon's article, another, entitled 'Walt Whitman,' appeared in the seventh number[2] of the *Renaissance artistique et littéraire.* One of the chief writers in this review was a Parnassian poet, M. Émile Blémont, who contributed a series of articles on 'Poetry in England and the United States.' For the first number he wrote an essay on Swinburne, in the course of which he mentions the poem in *Songs before Sunrise* to 'Walt-Whitman, le grand poète de la démocratie américaine.' This remark, dated April 27, 1872, is the earliest mention of Whitman we have found in French. How entirely he was unknown in France at that period may be judged from the opening remarks of M. Blémont's enthusiastic article, which deserves to rank among the warmest of foreign tributes to a poet who, unlike Longfellow, Bryant and Poe, is 'absolument, essentiellement américain.' The writer gives a short biography of the 'pur Yankee,' and concludes the first instalment of his essay with a summary of Whitman's preface of 1855. M. Blémont's article is continued in no. 11 (July 6, 1872). Whitman is found to be no versifier, indeed he has few artistic preoccupations. 'Persuadé que le fond emporte la forme,

[1] It is equally inconceivable how she came to write of the 'succès prodigieux' of the *Leaves.*

[2] On the last page of the same number we find the following significant note. 'Le dernier numéro de la *Revue des deux Mondes* renferme un remarquable article sur Walt Whitman, le poète américain. L'article sur le même sujet que publie aujourd'hui *La Renaissance* était prêt depuis longtemps; mais l'abondance des matières nous a forcés à en retarder jusqu'à ce jour l'apparition. Nous aurions voulu être les premiers à signaler Whitman. Mais notre point de vue et celui de la noble *Revue* diffèrent tellement que nous pourrions conserver des prétentions à la découverte de cette nouvelle étoile (L. Rubio).'

sûr que l'âme jaillissante se creuse naturellement et invinciblement son lit, il n'a cure de faire pour ce torrent des quais et des passerelles.' The writer's enthusiasm does not blind him to the defects of such a style, but he feels that if Whitman's faults are monstrous, it is because the poet is a giant: 'S'il n'est pas l'art, il est bien plus, il est la vie.' The essay is concluded in the next number (July 13), with descriptions of the longer poems of the *Leaves* and extensive quotations. Last of all comes a glowing eulogy of the American poet. Unfortunately, while the article in the *Revue des deux Mondes* was widely read, M. Blémont's appreciation, written for an early number of a much less influential periodical, passed almost unnoticed. Oddly enough, on the other side of the Atlantic, the poet, to whom a friend translated some fragments of Mme Bentzon's article, expressed his joy and gratitude for what he considered a homage rendered to his work by French thought. Apparently, the friendly translator either did not understand the article or rendered only the laudatory passages. M. Blémont's essay, enlarged by a postscript, reappeared in a small volume entitled *Beautés étrangères*, which he published in 1904. From his new point of vantage, he sums up the influence of Whitman in France since 1872.

In February, 1884, the *Revue politique et littéraire* published a broad and comprehensive essay on Whitman by M. Léo Quesnel, who feels there must be something in Whitman quite foreign to the French genius, which accounts for his being almost entirely unknown in France, 'où son nom seul a frappé les oreilles.' The reason given is that Whitman is not artist enough to appeal to the writer's countrymen: 'Ses vers pour nous ne sont pas des vers.' The *Leaves* are poetic prose if you will, but they have nothing in common with the art of versification. Yet there are indications that the poetry of the future will lay more stress on matter than form, and that form will become more amorphous, more suitable to the multifarious variety of modern subjects. In this case, Whitman will not be wrong in considering himself 'l'initiateur d'une poétique nouvelle, faite à la taille de destinées incommensurables de l'Amérique, un Christophe Colomb de la littérature.' In another passage which we have quoted, the author declares that Whitman is untranslatable, and therefore leaves his only quotation in the language of the original, appending a free translation as footnote.

But the most adequate of these early appreciations of Whitman in France appeared in *La Nouvelle Revue* for May 1, 1888. This study was written by M. Gabriel Sarrazin after the publication of two new

editions of *Leaves of Grass*[1] and *Specimen Days*[2]. In the *Revue contemporaine* for March 25, 1885[3], M. Sarrazin had written: 'Les vrais poètes panthéistes...savent qu'il faut vivre en harmonie avec tous les incidents et accidents des mondes, et le grand Walt Whitman s'écrie à la fin de ses *Leaves of Grass*: "Tout est vérité et désormais je veux célébrer tout, chantant et me rejouissant sans dénier quoi que ce soit."' Not content with giving an interesting *causerie* on a 'new' poet, the author strives to reach the altitude of Whitman's universal enthusiasm or to fathom the deeps of his thought and sympathy. 'La poésie de Walt Whitman,' he says, 'proclama la première le panthéisme complet, sans atténuation, et avec toutes ses conséquences.' Once again, as was the case with the prophets of old, a living soul speaks to the Supreme God—a living soul who means to maintain his identity throughout eternity. 'Whitman,' says the writer, 'n'est pas un artiste: il est au-dessus de l'art'; and he gives a number of long translations to illustrate the characteristics of Whitman's poetry. The study ends with a warm appreciation of Whitman as a man.

Whitman's death was the occasion of a few articles in the French reviews. The *Revue politique et littéraire*, which had already given M. Léo Quesnel's essay, inserted another interesting article on Whitman, by M. de Wyzewa, to which we shall refer later. *Les Entretiens politiques et littéraires* published a short article by M. Vielé-Griffin entitled 'Autobiographie de Walt Whitman[4],' ending with this confession: 'Quelques pages de Whitman ont été traduites en français; la première, *Étoile de France* (traduite par Jules Laforgue et imprimée dans *La Vogue*), est un généreux et enthousiaste salut d'espoir à la vaincue de '70....J'ai offert il y a deux ans *pour rien* une traduction de Whitman à l'éditeur Savine, il me fut gracieusement répondu que l'auteur de *Brins d'Herbe* était "trop peu connu."' The same year saw the publication in the *Revue Encyclopédique* of B. H. Gausseron's article, dealing mostly with Whitman's life and personality, and concluding with a brief bibliography. Nothing more of importance seems to have been written in France about Whitman for nearly ten years[5].

[1] Glasgow, Wilson and McCormac, 1884.
[2] London, Walter Scott, 1887.
[3] Tome i, No. 3.
[4] This is little more than a translation of an article on the 'only American poet' in the *New York Herald* for January 24, 1892.
[5] We may note in passing an amusing reference to Whitman in M. Léon A. Daudet's satire *Les Kamtchatka* (1895). Mention of Whitman in connection with the early Symbolists or decadents is not without significance (p. 94).

The last essay inspired by the American poet in France before the appearance of M. Bazalgette's biography was a lecture[1] delivered by Joseph Lecomte on Feb. 2, 1907, at the Université populaire du quartier Nord-Est of Brussels; it is interesting for the translations which it contains: these attempt to reproduce the form of the original poems. From the bibliography we transcribe the following: 'J'ai connu l'existence de Whitman,' writes Lecomte, 'par un passage d'*Escal Vigor* (2e partie, chap. viii), roman que je lus en 1901. Plus tard un article de J. de Norvins paru dans la *Revue des Revues* du 15 jan. 1902, m'apprit que Whitman faisait "vibrer dans la poésie l'accent du progrès et de l'humanitarisme." Puis le *Nouveau Larousse illustré* me fit connaître la date du décès du poète et le titre de son œuvre principale.'

In June, 1908, the Society of the Mercure de France published *Walt Whitman, l'Homme et son Œuvre*, in which M. Léon Bazalgette gave France her first biography of Whitman and the world one of the most enthusiastic appreciations of the American prophet-poet. 'C'est à Bazalgette,' writes a prominent French critic[2], 'que nous devons d'aimer Whitman. Le même homme qui a mené à bien la plus pieuse, la plus respectueuse des traductions, a compris qu'il ne fallait pas ignorer la vie d'un écrivain qui voulut que ses actes demeurassent ses plus beaux poèmes.'

What is the significance of these essays and translations published over a period of thirty years in France? Are they merely accidental, the result of a sudden or superficial inspiration; or does the persistence with which French poets and critics have returned to the same subject point to the satisfying of some growing need? If but an indication of passing interest, the recurrence of Whitman's name in French reviews must be explained by the 'novelty,' the naïve 'originality' of the first Yankee poet. A matter of momentary notice affording a ready subject for feminine raillery, he undoubtedly was to Mme Thérèse Bentzon, and it is surprising that the venerable *Revue des deux Mondes* should have devoted twenty pages to a poet so unworthy of the name as 'le prétendu Christophe Colomb de l'art américain' was alleged to be.

[1] We quote this list of subsequent lectures: 'En janvier 1909 Joseph Lecomte fait deux conférences, l'une à l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales, l'autre à l'Université populaire du faubourg Saint-Antoine. La traduction des *Feuilles d'herbe* paraît. Une autre conférence est faite à l'Université populaire du faubourg Saint-Antoine par Paul-Hyacinthe Loyson. A l'Université Nouvelle de Bruxelles, Louis Pierard, le poète des *Images Boraines* et l'observateur de la vie du peuple, consacre trois causeries aux *Feuilles d'Herbe* cependant qu'infatigable J. Lecomte va les présenter au public ouvrier de Frameries et Philéas Lebesgue fait un superbe portrait, à Rouen, à Elbeuf-sur-Seine et à Dieppe' (Henri Guilbeaux, *Portraits d'Hier*, No. 37, Sept. 15, 1910).

[2] M. Georges Duhamel, *Propos Critiques*, p. 22.

Even more impotent than the early venomous attacks launched against the *Leaves of Grass* by American reviews, this first French criticism seems to have had no effect on the growing interest felt for Whitman in France ever since M. Blémont's fervent but ill-fated essay in the *Renaissance artistique et littéraire.*

We find the possibility of Whitman's influence in France discussed first by M. Léo Quesnel in 1884. He speaks of the gulf separating Whitman's 'inartistic' poetry from French art; but prophesies a possible tendency in Whitman's direction. He seems to have had a glimpse of the truth when he said: 'Nous croyons que l'avenir sera, en matière de poésie, plus exigeant sur la pensée que sur la forme; que l'abandon, commencé en Angleterre de la rime et en France de la césure, est le premier pas vers l'habitude d'une harmonie plus large et plus mâle. S'il en est ainsi, Whitman sera un des hommes qui auront, non pas atteint, mais marqué le but.' But nowhere is the question of the supposed influence of Whitman on the early Symbolists so fully discussed as in an article which M. Teodor de Wyzewa published as early as 1892 in *La Revue Bleue*, and from which we take the following striking passages. 'Lorsque, dans quelques années, nous serons enfin débarrassés du XIX^e^ siècle, les critiques chargés de procéder à sa liquidation seront stupéfaits d'avoir à constater l'énorme influence de Walt Whitman sur notre mouvement littéraire contemporain. Car il leur faudra bien reconnaître que de toutes les innovations tentées depuis vingt-cinq ans dans notre littérature, et de celles qui touchent la forme, et de celles qui touchent les idées et les sentiments, il n'y en a pas une qui ne se trouve indiquée, réalisée, peut-être même exagérée dans le premier volume des poèmes de Walt Whitman, les *Brins d'Herbe*, publié en 1855.' The writer finds in the *Leaves* not only the most radical naturalism, but free verse and subjective lyricism carried to their furthest extremes. 'Nos poètes s'essayent depuis tantôt dix ans à libérer le vers; jamais pourtant ils n'oseront pousser la libération au point où l'a d'emblée poussée Walt Whitman....Après le vers libre, nous avons eu le culte et la culture du moi. Ce sont encore deux choses que Walt Whitman a bien connues et dès 1885...à toutes les phases de la culture de son moi il a pris soin d'intéresser ses lecteurs; il poussait jusqu'à la manie le goût de l'autobiographie.' Speaking of the beneficial influence which another aspect of Whitman's poetry might have on the young poets of his day, M. de Wyzewa writes: 'On ne saurait leur proposer un plus enviable modèle de *compagnon de la vie nouvelle*, ou, comme on dit encore, de néo-chrétien....Quand il ne chante

pas lui-même, Whitman chante la démocratie américaine, y rattachant la civilisation, la science, les derniers progrès de l'industrie. Il s'attendrit sans cesse; et de préférence il s'attendrit sur les chemins de fer, les expositions, le suffrage universel, le phonographe. La Tour Eiffel, s'il avait eu le bonheur de l'apercevoir, l'aurait exalté davantage encore qu'elle n'exalte M. Henri Bérenger. Et comme à M. H. Bérenger, comme à ses maîtres et à ses confrères, la vue du monde moderne inspirait à Whitman une morale toute d'action et de compassion.' Even if it be maintained that the dominant trait of French literature for the last twenty-five years has been the search for novelty, in this point again, Whitman is acknowledged a forerunner.

Thus M. de Wyzewa concludes that, as far back as 1885, Walt Whitman practised all the innovations which since that time have been attempted in French literature. Then in a striking passage he abruptly denies the possibility of Whitman's influence: 'Les critiques du XX^e^ siècle auront là une excellente occasion de se tromper. Car malgré que les poèmes de Walt Whitman datent de 1855 et qu'ils présentent déjà en apparence, tous les caractères que présentent les œuvres de nos écrivains d'aujourd'hui, la vérité est qu'ils n'ont exercé sur le mouvement littéraire contemporain aucune influence ou à peu près.' In the first place, very few of the contemporary writers knew him: 'Il y a bien eu chez nous, en outre de M. Sarrazin, deux ou trois jeunes gens pour apprécier Walt Whitman: ainsi M. Desjardins, qui en a si noblement parlé; ainsi Jules Laforgue...qui ne se fatiguait pas de lire les *Brins d'Herbe* aux dernières années de sa courte vie. Mais sur ceux-là même l'œuvre du poète américain n'a exercé aucune influence.' In the second place, in spite of the apparent resemblance of sentiments, ideas and form, there was really nothing in common between the poetry of Walt Whitman and contemporary French poetry. Although born in the nineteenth century, Whitman was none the less a primitive. The singularity of his poetry was not the result of reflection nor of a desire to react against outworn traditions, but the spontaneous expression of his singular nature, itself the result of his origin, his temperament and the circumstances of his life.

The opposite point of view to that expressed in this conclusion was put forward by M. Émile Blémont in 1904. Referring to the free verse movement, he says: 'De cette époque date l'action incontestable de Walt Whitman sur le mouvement poétique qui se développa en France au déclin du dernier siècle; car on peut affirmer que l'auteur des *Brins d'Herbe* exerça sur les "Verslibristes" et autres groupes émancipateurs

une influence analogue, mais diamétricalement contraire à celle qu'avait exercée Edgar Poë sur les Parnassiens.' But M. Blémont mentions no names and gives no proof of his statements. All he succeeds in doing is to show Whitman's priority in the matter of literary innovation: 'Il réalisa d'avance le programme, singulièrement élargi de nos écoles nouvelles;...il affirma à la bonne franquette, tout ce que plus tard promulguèrent, avec des transports hystériques, nos symbolistes et nos décadents, tout sauf la décadence qui rend la vie indigne d'être vécue, tout sauf le symbolisme qui tue le corps et l'âme à coups d'abstractions.'

From the translations of *Leaves of Grass* made in France since 1886, we conclude that if Whitman cannot be said to have exerted any direct influence on the Symbolist movement, he was of more than passing interest to one or two of the leading Symbolist poets with whom he shared not a few ideals and whom he anticipated in many daring reforms. Except to this small but growing number of admirers, Whitman's work was practically unknown in France before 1908. It is difficult to decide whether M. Bazalgette undertook the task of popularising Whitman in France to supply an artistic demand already expressed, or in the hope of endowing French literature with a new source of inspiration. The latter seems the more likely reason. In any case, M. Bazalgette confesses to have been more amply rewarded than he dared to hope. Since the publication of *Les Feuilles d'herbe* in 1909, Whitman rivals M. Verhaeren as the inspirer of the younger generation of contemporary French poets. To-day, in France the analogies with Whitman are manifold. As M. Charles Vildrac writes[1]: 'Nul moment de littérature ne pouvait être plus favorable que celui-ci à notre découverte de Whitman....L'œuvre du barde de Manhattan s'implante chez nous comme un grand arbre du nouveau monde.'

Whitman in France.

A list of translations from, and studies etc. on Whitman published in France before 1909.

Year	Translations	Studies, Articles etc.
1872		Thérèse Bentzon, *Un poète américain, Walt Whitman*, in *Revue des deux mondes*, June 1.
		Émile Blémont, *La poésie en Angleterre et aux Etats Unis: III. Walt Whitman*, in *La Renaissance artistique et littéraire*, No. 7, June 7; No. 11, July 6; and No. 12, July 13.

[1] *Les Feuilles de Mai*, No. 3, April—June, 1913.

Year	Translations	Studies, Articles etc.
1884		Léo Quesnel, *Poètes américains—Walt Whitman*, in *Revue politique et littéraire*, 3. série—4. année (1. semestre), No. 7, Feb. 16.
1886	Jules Laforgue, Dédicaces (Inscriptions, *L. of G.*, I, pp. 1—15). Je chante le soi-même (One's-self I sing); Aux nations étrangères (To foreign lands); À un Historien (To a Historian); À une certaine cantatrice (To a certain cantatrice); Ne fermez pas vos portes (Shut not your doors); Poètes à venir (Poets to come); À vous (To you); Toi lecteur (Thou reader), in *La Vogue*, No. 10, June 28—July 5. O Étoile de France (O star of France, *L. of G.*, II, p. 170), in *La Vogue*, No. 11, July 5—12. Une femme m'attend (A woman waits for me, *L. of G.*, I, p. 124), in *La Vogue*, No. 3, vol. II, August 2—9.	
1888	Francis Vielé-Griffin, Visages (Faces, *L. of G.*, II, p. 244); À une locomotive en hiver (To a locomotive in winter, *L. of G.*, II, p. 253); Un monde (The world below the brine, *L. of G.*, II, p. 21), in *Revue Indépendante*, No. 25, tome IX, November.	Gabriel Sarrazin, *Poètes modernes de l'Amérique, Walt Whitman*, in *La Nouvelle Revue*, May 1.
1889	Francis Vielé-Griffin, Il y avait un enfant qui partait chaque jour (There was a child went forth, *L. of G.*, I, p. 135), in *La Cravache*, 9 année, 1889, 1er juin, No. 432. Francis Vielé-Griffin, Le chant de la hache (The song of the broad-axe, *L. of G.*, I, p. 223), in *L'Ermitage*, vol. I, p. 293.	
1892	Francis Vielé-Griffin, À quelque révolutionnaire d'Europe dans la défaite (To a foiled European Revolutionnaire, *L. of G.*, II, p. 142), in *Les Entretiens politiques et littéraires*, vol. V, No. 32, November.	Teodor de Wyzewa, *Walt Whitman*, in *Revue politique et littéraire* (Revue Bleue), No. 17 (1. semestre), Tome 49, April 23. Francis Vielé-Griffin, *Autobiographie de Walt Whitman*, in *Les Entretiens politiques et littéraires*, vol. IV, No. 25, April. B. H. Gausseron, *Walt Whitman*, in *Revue Encyclopédique*, No. 35, Tome II.
1894	Laurence Jerrold, Qui que ce soit (To you, *L. of G.*, I, p. 284); Le Poète, translation of first part of 'Song of the Answerer' (*L. of G.*, I, p. 200); Chant au	

Year	Translations	Studies, Articles etc.
	Soleil Couchant (Song at Sunset, *L. of G.*, II, p. 278), in *Le Magasin International*, No. 1, December.	
1901		Daniel Halévy, Article on Walt Whitman, in *Pages libres.*
1902	Henry D. Davray, *Specimen Days*, in *L'Ermitage*, vol. II, p. 423.	
1903	Henry D. Davray, *Specimen Days*, in *L'Ermitage*, vol. I, pp. 60, 112, 201.	John Cutler Couvert, *Quelques Poètes Américains*; Longfellow, Whitman, Poe. Lyons, Cumin and Masson.
1904	Louis Fabulet, O Sud aimant (O Magnet South! *L. of G.*, II, p. 254); A un étranger (To a Stranger, *L. of G.*, I, p. 153); Quand j'appris à la chute du jour (When I heard at the close of day, *L. of G.*, I, p. 148), in *L'Ermitage*, vol. I, p. 212.	
1905	Louis Fabulet, J'ai traversé jadis une ville populeuse (Once I pass'd through a populous city, *L. of G.*, I, p. 134); Battez, battez, tambours! (Beat, beat! drums! *L. of G.*, II, p. 44); Reviens des champs, père (Come up from the fields, father, *L. of G.*, II, p. 65); Mouvements primitifs (?); Étrange veillée (Vigil strange I kept on the field of night, *L. of G.*, II, p. 67); O Étoile de France (O Star of France, *L. of G.*, II, p. 170).	
1907		Elsie Masson, *Walt Whitman poète et ouvrier*, in *Mercure de France*, August.
1908		Joseph Lecomte, *Un poète américain: Walt Whitman* (Conférence faite à l'Université populaire du quartier Nord-Est de Bruxelles, le 2 Feb., 1907), in *La Vie Intellectuelle*, 1 année, No. 1, 15 Feb. Léon Bazalgette, *Walt Whitman, l'Homme et son Œuvre*, Paris, Société de la Mercure de France, June.
1909	Léon Bazalgette, *Les Feuilles d'Herbe*, Complete translation of the *Leaves of Grass.*	

P. M. JONES.

ABERYSTWYTH.

THE RUTHWELL AND BEWCASTLE CROSSES.

Perhaps the most comprehensive attempt to solve the vexed question of the date of the two famous Northumbrian Crosses of Ruthwell and Bewcastle is that recently made by Prof. A. S. Cook in his monograph entitled 'The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses' (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Yale University Press, 1912). As a result of his investigation, Prof. Cook has come to the somewhat remarkable conclusion that these monuments do not date from the seventh or eighth century, as has generally been supposed, but from the time of King David I. of Scotland (1124–1153). His views have been examined in the *Burlington Magazine* by Prof. G. Baldwin Brown[1] and by Prof. W. R. Lethaby[1], who have expressed the opinion that Prof. Cook's conclusions are incompatible with what we know of the history of early mediaeval art in this country. Professor Lethaby, who is 'entirely convinced that the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses are works of the high day of the Northumbrian school of art at the end of the seventh century,' has also shown that Prof. Cook's views are open to serious objection from the point of view of Latin epigraphy. Finally, in an article entitled 'A Dangerous Archaeological Method[2],' Sir Martin Conway effectually exposes the weakness inherent in Prof. Cook's method of piecemeal archaeological analogy.

In the same publication[3] we have endeavoured to show that the character of the Runic writing—to the history of which, we regret to see, Professor Cook has scarcely paid sufficient attention—presents difficulties still more serious. Our conclusion there was, that there is no evidence that the use of the English Runic alphabet survived

[1] Vol. xxiii, April, 1913. We may refer also to articles on the same subject by Prof. Lethaby in Vol. xxi of the *Burlington Magazine*, June, 1912; and by Sir Martin Conway, Vol. xxi, July, 1912. The last named adduces a number of seventh century art parallels to the two great Crosses, and declares 'it may well be that many of these dates rest upon disputable foundations, but their concurrence is an important fact, and it is not easy to dispose of all of them whilst unity of style holds them together, and one substantial date will suffice for all.'

[2] The *Burlington Magazine*, Part i, Vol. xxiii, Sept. 1913, p. 339. Part ii, Vol. xxiv, Nov. 1913, p. 85.

[3] *Burlington Magazine*, April, 1914.

the great Danish invasion of the latter half of the ninth century[1], whilst the Runic inscriptions of the twelfth century in this district are in a totally different form (i.e., Norwegian) of the Runic alphabet. Beyond this we found it difficult to say anything more definite, because after 700 the Northumbrian Runic alphabet changed but little. From the standpoint of orthography, however, we are inclined to favour the eighth rather than the ninth century for the origin of the inscriptions. We propose here to examine and discuss the linguistic arguments which Prof. Cook has adduced in favour of the singularly late date which he ascribes to the two monuments.

The language of the inscriptions has generally been regarded as of an archaic character.

In regard to the Ruthwell Cross it has been remarked that unaccented syllables usually show *æ* and *i* in forms where O.E. texts as a rule have uniform *e*. This phenomenon is elsewhere met with only in the very earliest texts, e.g., the Epinal Glossary. In his paper entitled 'Notes on the Ruthwell Cross,' which appeared in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XVII (1902), Prof. Cook points out on p. 385 that both *æ* and *i* occur sporadically in Northumbrian texts of the tenth century, although they are not always correctly used. He also urges the occurrence of *e* for *i* in *geredæ*[2] and for *æ* in *fore, sare, walde*[3]. In the last three cases, however, the letter *e* is marked as doubtful by Viëtor. Moreover, it is to be remarked that the change from *i* to *e* in unaccented syllables, at least in the South, where alone we have contemporary evidence, must have begun before the close of the seventh century. It appears, e.g., in an (original) East Saxon Charter[4] of 692–3, which shows the change in three forms—*oedel, stede, hædde*—and which also shows at least three instances of *e* for *æ*. Both phenomena also occur in (original) Mercian Charters of 736 and 742. In Northumbrian, unaccented *i* and *æ* seem to have been preserved in writing later than elsewhere. Thus *i* is usually written in the *Liber Vitæ*, although *e* does occur—e.g., *Dene, Hiodde, Baede, -here, Boesel*. In the *Nomina Reginarum et Abbatissarum*[5] *æ* alone is written in the earlier part of the list, *e* alone (two examples) in the later part,

[1] It is true that the Runic letters (apart from *wynn* and *þorn*) frequently occur in MSS. of the tenth and eleventh centuries, especially in Abcdaria and Riddles. But these are without doubt usually derived from earlier MSS, and appear to contain very many mistakes. It is likely enough, however, that in the South of England an antiquarian interest was maintained in this form of writing down to the eleventh century.

[2] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 386. [3] *Ib.*, p. 388.

[4] Sweet, *O.E.T.*, No. 1; Birch, *Cart. Sax.*, I, 115, No. 81.

[5] Sweet, *O.E.T.*, p. 154 f.

which shows that the change goes back to the eighth century. This is proved also by the occurrence of *e* for *æ* in the text of Caedmon's Hymn in the Moore MS. of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and in Bede's Death-song. It is therefore important to observe that apparently no certain example of *e* for *æ* occurs in the Ruthwell inscription, where *æ*[1] is written at least seventeen times. *E* for *i* does occur once, perhaps twice (*uncet*, cf. p. 30). On the other hand there are four cases of unaccented *i*, in addition to the form *ni*, and four instances of the prefix *-gi*. It is true that the latter may be found in the second part of the Rushworth text and in the Ritual, but the former is extremely rare except in the earliest texts.

As proofs of the late date of the inscriptions under review, Prof. Cook urges the following forms:

(1) *æþþilæ*[2], which he regards as a later form of the common O.E. *æðel-*.

This is a most erroneous explanation. The facts are:

(*a*) That in the second syllable of this word *i* is universal in the Moore MS. of Bede's *History* (737), and in the *Liber Vitæ*, while in non-Northumbrian texts it is almost, if not quite, universal down to about 740. Attention is particularly deserved by the several letters quoted by Bede in his *History*, which appear to represent faithfully the orthography of documents of the early part of the seventh century.

(*b*) That, from about 740 on, *e* becomes decidedly more common than *i*, except in the *Liber Vitæ*.

(*c*) That the first syllable in the *Liber Vitæ* has usually *e*, several instances of which occur also in the Moore MS. of Bede's *History*.

From these facts it is clear

(i) That the earliest known form of the word in English is *æþil-*.

(ii) That in Northumbrian this had changed to *eþil-* before 737. The fact that four instances of *æðil-* occur in the *Liber Vitæ* against about ninety of *eðil-* is no evidence to the contrary. One, at least, of these is evidently the name of a Mercian.

(iii) That in the other dialects the original word changed to *æþel-* about the same period. This latter form does not occur in Northumbrian where *eþel-* represents the later development.

The evidence of the form *æþþilæ* therefore, if it is to be trusted[3], is

[1] It is to be remarked that in Runic inscriptions *æ* is represented by a single letter.

[2] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 384.

[3] The first letter is marked as uncertain by Viëtor, but from Prof. Cook's photograph it appears to be an *æ*. At all events it is clear that there is no room here for *e* (a broader letter), which is the only possible alternative.

strongly in favour of a date not later than about 750 for the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross.

(2) *heafun, heafunœs.*

(*a*) It is scarcely correct to say[1] that the *-un* of *heafun* represents a later form than the *e* of *heben* or the *œ* of *hefœn* (*hefœnricœs*) in Caedmon's Hymn. *heƀun* and *heƀœn* are rather to be regarded as parallel stems arising through different accentual conditions, the former being probably regular in the oblique cases.

(*b*) With reference to the first syllable Prof. Cook says[2] 'the normal *eo*, by *u*-umlaut from this earlier *e*, has here been replaced by *ea*, which properly should occur only as the product of *o*-umlaut.' But surely the true form of the statement is that the same letter is used for both *ea* and *eo*, owing to the similarity of these diphthongs in Northumbrian. In the Moore MS. of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (dating from about 737) *ea* is not infrequently written for *eo*—e.g., *Earconualdum*, IV. 6; *Earcongotam*, III. 8; *Earconberct*, III. 8, IV. 17, V. 24; *Earpualdo*, II. 15, and perhaps also *Streanœshalch*, III. 24, IV. 24, V. 24. Conversely, on coins of the Northumbrian king Eadberht (737–758) the king's name is written *Eotberhet(vs)* in eight cases out of nine. It is clear, then, that the difference of pronunciation between these two diphthongs was very slight in Northumbrian of the early eighth century.

(3) *gistiga, hœlda.*

Prof. Cook says[3] 'The loss of final *n* in the infinitive is one of the most distinctive marks of late North., but so far as I know there is only one instance of it in early North. and that is the *cnyssa* of the "Leiden Riddle."' There appear, however, to be only three instances of the infinitive preserved in early Northumbrian.

For the loss of *n* after *a* in cases other than the infinitive, the proper names preserved in the earliest MS. (Moore) of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* afford a number of instances.—*Ceadda* (Genitive), Praef. and IV. 3; *Ceadda* (Dative), III. 23, IV. 3; *in fluvio Treenta, Treanta, Sualua*, II. 16, II. 14, III. 24; *fluvium Treanta*, IV. 21; *Penda regem*, II. 20; *Anna regis*, III. 22, 24, IV. 19; *Grantacaestir, Tunnacaestir*, IV. 19, 22 (cf. *Uintancaestir*, III. 7), etc.

(4) *galgu.*

For the form *galgu*, whatever may be its true explanation, we have early Northumbrian parallels in the forms *fold(u)* of Caedmon's Hymn and *eorƀu* (Leiden Riddle), as noted by Prof. Cook himself[4].

[1] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 384. [2] *Ib.*, p. 384.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 388. [4] *Ib.*, p. 384.

(5) *cwomu, bismærædu.*

The forms which present real difficulty are the Pret. Plurals *cwomu* and *bismærædu*[1]—as against *alegdun, gistoddun,* and probably *healdun,* where *n* is preserved.

In late Northumbrian texts the *n* is regularly preserved in such forms, with the few exceptions noted by Prof. Cook. But it cannot fairly be inferred from this that the Ruthwell forms are later than those of Lindisfarne, Ritual, etc., for the latter usually have *-on*[2], with the change of unaccented *u* to *o*, which took place apparently in all Anglo-Saxon dialects in the course of the ninth century, whereas the Ruthwell forms invariably have *-u.*

The explanation of the *n*-less forms is possibly to be found in the original existence of sandhi doublets, the retention or loss of *n* being later regularised by analogy. The Ruthwell forms cannot, however, be explained as being in true sandhi positions, as *n* is wanting before vowels.

That the loss of *n* took place regularly after *u*, as after other vowels, at least in certain positions in early Northumbrian is shown by the form *sifu* which occurs twice in Napier's *Vatican Glosses*[3].

(6) *u͡ngget.*

This is the form which appears in Stephens, but Viëtor, after careful examination, came to the conclusion that the third letter was probably a *k* (*c*).

It may be that *uncet* is a later form than *incit,* as Prof. Cook thinks[4], in which case it will be parallel to *geredæ,* but the change of unaccented *i* to *e* goes back, as we have already seen, p. 29, to the seventh century.

Cook also states that the substitution of the Rune *ng,* a single letter, for *n,* is sufficiently remarkable, but in this, we think, few students of epigraphy will be inclined to agree with him. The phenomenon can be paralleled in one of the earliest inscriptions in the North (Opedal).

(7) *dorstæ.*

Prof. Cook declares[5], '*dorstæ* is not Northumbrian at all; we should have *darstæ.* Yet *dorstæ* is certified by Viëtor, and we must therefore assume that our inscription mixes dialects as well as periods.' Later[6], he is still more explicit: 'at least one word, *dorstæ,* is, in its radical

[1] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross,* p. 389.

[2] Cf. Sievers' *Ags. Gramm.* 3, § 364, Anm. 4. In St Mark's Gospel (Lind.) the proportion of *-on* : *-un* seems to be about 20 : 3; cf. E. L. Lea, *The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of St Mark,* in *Anglia,* XVI, p. 147.

[3] Napier, *Old English Glosses,* p. 220 (*Glossae in Psalmos.* Ps. 74. 14).

[4] *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses* (Yale, 1912), pp. 245–247.

[5] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross,* p. 386. [6] *Ib.,* p. 390.

vowel, not Northumbrian at all, while it is of the dialect of the Rood'..., and in 1912 the same words are repeated[1].

But Prof. Cook seems to have overlooked the fact that the vowel *o* is the original vowel, as is shown by Gothic *gadaursta*, O.H.G. *gitorsta*. The late Northumbrian form *gedarste* takes its vowel from the analogy of the present, *darr*, and the Ruthwell inscription must date from a time *before* this analogy had operated. This form, therefore, is a strong argument for an early date (how early we cannot say), and not for a mixture of dialects.

(8) The use of *f*, finally and medially, for original *ƀ*[2] (*of, heafun, hlafard, gidroefid, heafdum*).

In such cases the Moore MS. of Bede has *f* in most cases—e.g., *aelf-*, III. 1, 24; IV. 21; V. 24; *suef-*, IV. 11; *gefrin*, II. 14; *eafa*, III. 24[3]. Other instances are—*Recuulf*[4], in an original Kentish charter of 679, and *Ricuulfi*[5] in another of 770; *wylif* (Franks Casket); *hefuen-* (Caedmon's Hymn); and *sifu*[6] (twice) in the *Vatican Gloss*.

(9) *kyningc*.

It is not easy to see how the *-gc* at the end of this word can indicate palatalisation, as Prof. Cook declares[7], considering the fact that the Runic character stands for *ng*, and not for the single letter *g*. The writing of *c* for *g* (explosive) is not unusual in the earliest texts—e.g., *Centinces*[8], in the East Saxon charter of 692; *Duningcland*[9], in an original Mercian charter of 788. A somewhat closer parallel is *Theodningc*[10], the name of a stream, which occurs in an original Mercian charter of 779.

(10) *almehttig*.

Prof. Cook seems to think *-ht* is a later form than *-ct*[11].

In the Runic alphabet *-ht* is regularly written for the phonetic combination *χt* from the earliest times (e.g., on the Tune inscription, *ƀohtriz* and *worahto*), a usage faithfully preserved, doubtless through Runic influence, in the Gothic alphabet.

But as a matter of fact the letter used here is, quite exceptionally, not the ordinary letter H, but the mysterious thirteenth letter which occurs elsewhere with the value *i* (Dover). As the value of this letter

[1] *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses*, p. 245.
[2] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 386.
[3] Chadwick, *Studies in Old English*. (*Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 1899.)
[4] Birch, *Cart. Sax.*, I, 70, No. 45; Sweet, *O.E.T.*, No. 4. [5] *O.E.T.*, No. 8.
[6] Napier, *O.E. Gloss*, 220. [7] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 386.
[8] Birch, *Cart. Sax.* I, 115, No. 81; Sweet, *O.E.T.* No. 1.
[9] Birch, *ib.* I, 353, No. 254; Sweet, *ib.*, No. 18.
[10] Birch, *ib.* I, 320, No. 230; Sweet, *ib.*, No. 14.
[11] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 387.

is given as *h* and *i* in Codex Salzburgensis 140, we are not entitled to say that the usage in either case is incorrect.

(11) The non-occurrence on the Ruthwell Cross of *d* and *t* for *þ*.

Prof. Cook draws attention to this phenomenon[1]. Such a usage, however, would be a mistake, and a mistake which actually occurs in one or two later inscriptions (e.g., Falstone, which is cited by Prof. Cook), and which obviously arises from the use by the engraver of a copy in Roman lettering. In earlier days, when the Runic alphabet was in more general use, such an error would naturally not occur.

The use of *d* and *t͡h* for the dental voiceless spirant and that of *c* (before *t*) and *ch* for the guttural voiceless spirant, are due, of course, to the inadequacy of the Latin alphabet for representing Teutonic sounds which did not occur in the Latin language.

Turning now to the Bewcastle column, we cannot but think that Prof. Cook has given insufficient weight to the statements made by Prof. Viëtor in his book *Die Northumbrischen Runensteine.* It is there pointed out that many of the letters, which may appear (p. 14) to be comparatively clear in the photographs, cannot be said to have been engraved on the stone at all, since they were painted over, apparently largely from conjecture, by Maughan, a former vicar of Bewcastle, in 1856.

(1) *Gessus*[2].

The use of initial *g* is perfectly regular in the Runic alphabet. A character[3] which is probably the form for *j* does occur twice in Runic inscriptions (i.e., Thornhill and Dover), both times in the word *gisl*, *gil(s)*, which originally had initial *g*. It is clear that the letters *g* and *j* were wholly confused, because the palatalised spirant *g* had become *j* by the middle of the seventh century, and, so far as we can judge, the result on the alphabet was that *j* was very rarely used.

For the age of the change of spirant *g* to *j*, we may note the consistent spelling *Iaruman* (for *Gearu-*) in early Bede MSS.—which at least suggests that that was the spelling used by the Bishop himself (who died before 670).

(2) *æft alcfriþu*[4].

If Viëtor is right in saying that the sixth letter is really *c*, and in reading the whole name as *Alcfriþu*, we have here a distinct mistake in the use of the Runic letters which could only be accounted for on the

[1] *Notes on the Ruthwell Cross*, p. 387.
[2] *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses*, p. 249.
[3] It is identical with the letter regularly used (in its later value, *a*) on certain Northern inscriptions of the transition period—e.g., Stentofta and Björketorp.
[4] *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses*, pp. 249 f.

supposition that the engraver was following a copy in Roman letters, and consequently writing *c* for *h* (= χ). From Viëtor's words, however, it appears that the first five letters[2] are by no means certain ('alle beschädigt, aber, wie ich glaube, vorhanden'). If so, we have no need to assume that the engraver has been guilty of any such error. The first element in the name may have been a word which really had final *-c*[1].

As regards the form *æft* to which Prof. Cook attaches so much importance, it is surely more likely that the two have been accidentally omitted[2], than that the engraver should have made use of a Scandinavian preposition for which there is, as far as we know, no evidence elsewhere in English. In view, however, of Viëtor's phrase 'alle beschädigt' we are inclined to regard this reading also with a good deal of scepticism.

(3) *cynnburug*[3].

With regard to the Svarabhakti in this word, this usage is common in Runic writing between *r* or *l* and voiceless spirants from the earliest times—e.g., *worahto* (Tune inscription), *worohtae* (Kirkheaton inscription), *wylif* (Franks Casket).

There is no doubt that before the end of the seventh century final *g*, not palatalised, was already voiceless (χ), though usually preserved in writing. We may refer to such forms as *mærh* (Epinal 588; *mærh*, Erf., Corp.), *duerh* (Erf. 1176), *haehtis*, *haehtisse* (Corp. 759, 945). Further evidence is afforded by the erroneous use of *g* for (original) *h*, e.g., *sceptog* for *sceptlog* (Corp. 145), *unneg*, *fegtaþ* (Franks Casket), *aerigfaerae* (Leid. Rid.), *Ealghard* for *Ealh-* (Chart. 18 in Sweet's *O.E.T.*), *-leag* (frequently in charters).

It might be well to note that with regard to the first part of the name *cynnburug*, Viëtor declares that the fourth letter is really *i*.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are led is that the language of the inscriptions points to the same period as that indicated by their orthographical characteristics. Certain features, e.g., the regular use of *f* for *ƀ*, the occasional appearance of *e* for *i* (and *æ*?) in unaccented syllables, and the frequent loss of final *n*, seem to us—like the form of the letter *d*—to militate somewhat against a date much earlier than the seventh century. On the other hand the form *æþþilæ*[4], which seems to be

[1] *Ecfriþu* (for *Ecgfriþu*) would scarcely be impossible. We must note that, if the form *Alcfriþu* or *Ecfriþu* is really correct, the final *u* is an argument for great antiquity. It is universally lost in names in Bede's *History* (except, of course, when those are Latinised). But the letter *u* really appears to be doubtful.

[2] Cf. the form *æfte* in one of the Thornhill inscriptions. [3] *Ib.* pp. 255–6.

[4] Cf. p. 29.

reasonably safe, and the usual retention of *æ* and *i* decidedly favour the eighth century rather than the ninth. Under no circumstances, however, can we credit the supposition that the inscriptions were written later than the ninth century, which on historical grounds practically means that they must date from before 867.

The linguistic evidence which we have just summarised comes almost wholly from the Ruthwell Cross; but we are by no means satisfied that the Bewcastle inscription really contains any forms which point to a different date[1].

M. D. Forbes.
Bruce Dickins.

Cambridge.

[1] Since this article was sent to press, a further monograph on the subject of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses has come to our notice. In *The Runic Roods of Ruthwell and Bewcastle* (John Smith and Son, Glasgow, 1914) Dr King Hewison ascribes the two monuments to the tenth century and to St Dunstan in particular. We have examined his arguments, but see no reason to modify the views expressed above.

THE 'SHIFTED LEAF' IN 'BEOWULF.'

Professor Blackburn in *Modern Philology*, IX, 555–66, argues that the 'confused order of events' in the story of the slaying of Grendel's mother is due to the shifting of a leaf. Professor Blackburn opens his argument thus:

> The story of the slaying of Grendel's mother, apart from the preparations at the beginning and the rejoicing at the end, may be analyzed as follows:
> i. Vss. 1497–1569. The fight and the death of the monster. (In the cave.)
> ii. Vss. 1570–90. Beowulf explores the den, finds Grendel dead, and strikes off his head. (In the cave.)
> iii. Vss. 1591–1605 a. The Danes wait until they are convinced that Beowulf has perished; they then return home, but the Geats, though hopeless, remain longer. (On the cliff.)
> iv. Vss. 1605 b–17. The sword-blade melts in the blood of Grendel, but Beowulf takes the hilt and the head as trophies. (In the cave.)
> v. Vss. 1619–43. Beowulf comes up from the den and swims to land; the Geats meet him and escort him back to Hrothgar's Hall.
> The purpose of this paper is to show the probability that a part of the story has been misplaced, to suggest a way in which this may have happened, to discuss the natural results of such an accident, and perhaps thus to contribute something to the method of discovering and correcting such faults elsewhere. I assume that originally the poet finished the account of the fight in the cave as described in I, II, and IV before telling what took place meanwhile on the cliff as related in III and V, and that the shift of scene from cave to cliff and back again, which we find in the poem as it has reached us, is the result of an exchange of the position of III and IV.

This method of exposition has one serious drawback. The story is summarised by a critic who regards it as confused. Starting with this feeling with regard to his text, such a critic is likely to show, in his summary, a want of sympathy towards the narrative which he is summarising. The summary may show 'a break in the continuity of the story,' but the question has still to be faced, 'Is this break due to the original story-teller or to the summariser'?

There certainly appears to be in Professor Blackburn's summary 'a break in continuity' between III, where we are told that the Danes return home, and the earlier sections I and II, where the slaying or mutilation of Grendel and his mother is narrated. But this 'break in continuity' is due to the simple fact that Professor Blackburn in his

summary has omitted the connecting link. The slaughter or mutilation of the monsters in the cave leads to the water being reddened with blood, and it is the sight of this blood that leads the Danes on the cliff to conclude that Beowulf is dead, and to return home.

The omission of this connecting link is serious, for the effect produced upon the mind of the watchers by the sight of the blood-stained water, so far from being negligible, is an essential and persisting feature of the story.

It will strike most readers as strange that Professor Blackburn, in dealing with the story of the fight in the underground cave, should have nothing to say concerning the order of events in the *Grettis Saga*. *Beowulf* and the *Grettis Saga* are here closely parallel, and, what is strictly to the point, they agree in giving the story in the form which Professor Blackburn regards as dislocated.

The main features of resemblance between *Beowulf* and the *Grettis Saga* in this portion of the tale are these:

The hero dives into the water, comes into a cave, and there fights with a monster whose blood he spills. [Beowulf also mutilates the dead body of an earlier adversary, Grendel.]

The watcher above [in *Beowulf* some of the watchers above], seeing the water stained with blood, concludes that the hero is slain, abandons his watch and goes home.

Meantime the hero surveys the cave; he swims back with certain trophies.

Now clearly the teller of a story like this may treat his subject in one of two ways. He may tell the story as it has been outlined above, that is to say as it is told in *Beowulf* and the *Grettis Saga*, thus:

(i) The hero slays the monster in the cave.

(ii) The watcher or watchers on the cliff, seeing the blood-stained water, depart.

(iii) Meantime the hero collects his trophies and swims back to the cliff.

Or the story-teller may prefer the following order:

(i) The hero slays the monster in the cave.

(ii) He collects his trophies and swims back, but

(iii) He finds the watchers on the cliff gone, because in the meantime they, seeing the blood-stained water, had departed.

To assume that the story *ought* only to be told in the second of these ways appears to me quite wrong. The first way seems quite as

good as the second, and at least equally in accordance with the rules of orderly modern narrative. By this first method the story-teller chooses the logical order of thought. He passes from the blood-shedding in the cave to the effect which this blood-shedding produces upon the watchers on the cliff, and then he turns back to consider further proceedings in the cave. Of course he might have chosen to maintain the continuity of place. He might have told to the end, without interruption, what happened in the cave, and only, when all the business in the cave was terminated, have come to consider the watchers on the cliff.

But when Professor Blackburn says:

> I assume that originally the poet finished the account of the fight in the cave as described in I, II and IV before telling what took place meanwhile on the cliff as related in III and V, and that the shift of scene from cave to cliff and back again, which we find in the poem as it has reached us, is the result of an exchange of the position of III and IV,

I can only ask, 'Why assume any such thing?'

Here is this portion of the story as told in the *Grettis Saga*:

> Then the giant tried to reach behind him for a sword which hung in the cave. Thereupon Grettir smote him in the breast, and struck off almost all the lower part of his chest and his belly, so that the entrails gushed out of him down into the river, and were swept along the current.
>
> And as the priest sat by the rope he saw some lumps clotted with blood carried down stream. Then he became unsteady and thought that now he knew that Grettir must be dead; and he ran from keeping the rope and went home. By that time it had come to evening. And he said for certain that Grettir was dead, and added that it was a great loss of such a man.
>
> Now the tale must be told concerning Grettir. He let little space go between his blows till the giant was dead. Then he went further into the cave; he kindled a light and examined it. It is not said how much wealth he took in the cave, but men think that it was something great. He stayed there far into the night. He found there the bones of two men, and put them into a bag. Then he left the cave and swam to the rope and shook it, for he thought that the priest must be there. But when he knew that the priest had gone home, then he had to draw himself up, hand over hand, and so he came up on to the cliff.

Now has any reader ever found this narrative either confused or discontinuous?

However, let it be granted, for the sake of argument, that the story, according to the orderly methods of modern narrative, is confused and not sufficiently continuous. Would this be sufficient reason why an Old English poet should not have told the story so? As a matter of fact, want of what a twentieth century narrator would regard as continuity is an essential feature of Old English epic. This has been pointed out by Heinzel[1], and has been laboured by so many recent critics

[1] *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, x, p. 220.

of Old English style that it is surely superfluous at this date to say more. It is coming to be increasingly recognised as a fundamental error of the theories of Müllenhoff and ten Brink that these critics did not allow for this backward and forward movement of Old English narrative, and therefore were too prone to assume that they had before them a poem either interpolated or put together by the contamination of two poems dealing with one and the same subject. If we are to adhere to the assumption that Old English narrative must conform to our modern notions of order, then I fail to see why we should abandon in favour of any new theory of a shifted leaf the old theory of ten Brink, that the poet is clumsily combining two parallel epics.

Precedents for shifted leaves can be adduced, true; but so can precedents for conflate texts. Precisely the same two objections can be raised to Professor Blackburn's theory as to ten Brink's, that in the first place it is based upon modern *a priori* notions of narrative rather than upon a study of what actually were the methods of old Germanic story-tellers; and secondly that it assumes a scribe working with very considerable care and skill in order to obliterate the traces of confusion. If an Old English scribe had really come across a shifted leaf of this kind in his original, we may well doubt whether he could or would have treated the passage with such skill, and have left it so straightforward a business as we now find it. Arguments for shifted leaves must be backed up by heavy evidence. We must feel that the passage does not make sense in the form in which it has been traditionally handed down, and that it *does* make sense when shifted back to the form which the critic postulates as original. It is not sufficient to show that with the alteration of a few words or lines you could shift a passage, and that it would still continue to make some sort of sense.

Finally let us grant for the sake of argument that the passage is not satisfactory according to modern notions as it stands in *Beowulf*, and that this is sufficient reason for assuming a shifted leaf. How then does Professor Blackburn account for the palpable *fact* that the order in the *Grettis Saga* is the same as the order in *Beowulf*? He will be compelled to discard any belief that *Beowulf* and the *Grettis Saga* derive their tradition from one common original. He will be forced to assume that the compiler of the *Grettis Saga* drew the story direct from *Beowulf*, and not merely from *Beowulf*, but actually from a manuscript of *Beowulf* which had this same peculiarity, resulting from a shifted leaf, which we find in our extant manuscript. He will have to assume

that the compiler of the *Grettis Saga* followed his original so slavishly that he actually took over and wove into his story this 'confused order of events.'

Yet if one thing above another is clear as to the relations of the *Grettis Saga* and *Beowulf*, I should have held it to be this: that, however the compiler of the *Saga* came to get the same story which we find in *Beowulf*, he did not get it by slavish copying of a manuscript of *Beowulf*[1].

R. W. CHAMBERS.

LONDON.

[1] Cf. for example, Vigfússon, *Corp. Poet. Boreale*, I, 502; Bugge, in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XII, p. 58; Panzer, *Beowulf*, 1910, pp. 319, etc. and Lawrence, 'The Haunted Mere in Beowulf' in the *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, XXVII, 2, pp. 208, etc.

CYNEWULF AND CYNEHEARD IN GAIMAR.

This episode, which is one of the most vividly described entries of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, has been the source of hopeless misunderstanding to Gaimar. The question has been carefully analysed by Max Gross in his dissertation: *Geffrei Gaimar, Die Komposition seiner Reimchronik und sein Verhältnis zu den Quellen* (Strassburg Dissertation, 1902)—a very useful study, though occasionally at fault in details owing to the lack of a critical edition—but some of his results appear to me not quite correct.

We read in the A. S. Chronicle under the year 754 that Sigebriht succeeded to the West Saxon throne and reigned one year, at the end of which period he was driven into exile by his relative Cynewulf on account of his wicked deeds ('for unrihtum dædum') and with the consent of the West Saxon *witan*. Gaimar has

> Treska cel jor co fu conte
> Ke [Kenewlf] deseritat
> [Sibrict] son cosin enchascat
> E les barons de la contree
> Par treison ke urent menee. ll. 1814–8[1]

Gross is inclined to consider 'les barons' in l. 1817 as an accusative and accounts for it by assuming a mistranslation on Gaimar's part, who however corrects his mistake in ll. 1833–7. In agreement with this view he gives the following rendering: 'bis zu dem Tage, wo Cynewulf Sigebriht enterbte; er (Cynewulf) vertrieb seinen Vetter und die Barone (accus.) des Landes wegen Verrats, den sie geübt hatten'; but is forced to emend 'par,' which is supported by the MSS., to 'pur.'

It seems to me, however, more natural to consider 'les barons' as nominative—there is of course no formal grammatical objection, cf. l. 1902—thus avoiding the awkward supposition of a later correction by Gaimar a few verses further on. Moreover the construction—a subject with an explanatory and parenthetical addition taking a singular verb—

[1] The names in brackets are taken from MSS. D, L, as those in R—Chewolf, Siebrant—are manifestly due to the scribe.

is not uncommon in Gaimar and its development can be traced in the poem itself. The first stage is probably to be found in a construction like

Wlfhere od tut ses Merceneis
Se cumbatid il e sa gent ll. 1414–5

where 'il e sa gent' is an explanatory parenthesis. The next step is to a sentence like

Dist Haveloc e sa mulier l. 469

or

Il me load e sa mullier l. 606

and then to a more complicated form,

Puis regnad Edelwlf sun fiz
E Adelstan un rei gentilz ll. 2309–10

(which corresponds to the case in point) and even with an intervening clause,

Suz ciel naveit nul chevalier
Ke ja cel corn peust soner
Ne veneur ne bacheler. ll. 674–6

(I reserve further discussion of this construction for the critical edition of Gaimar which I am preparing.) Thus I think I have shown there can be no objection on the score of the position of the words to regarding 'les barons' as a nominative, which is really the ground for Gross's rejection of this view. Moreover for this particular case Gaimar had an additional incentive to use this construction, viz., his original, where we read: 'Her Cynewulf benam Sigebriht his rices ond Westseaxna witan for unrihtum dædum.'

Another point of interest is: whom does Gaimar mean by Sibrict? In the Royal MS. we have two names, generally written Siebrant and Sibrict, which are much confused; in the other MSS. on the contrary Sibrict is the name used throughout with reference to the prince who takes part with Cyneheard in the attack on the king; Siebrant is only mentioned in l. 1874 as Sibrict's father. We have, however, the name Siebart in l. 1809 where we should expect a form Sibrict (= Sigebriht of the Chronicle). Evidently these MSS. intend this to represent a different name, but what name? I think the true reading is the one indicated by Siebart, which is a scribal error, and preserved in R, viz., Siebrant (cf. a similar error in D 1903, where we find Cumbart = Cumbrant in L) and that the same person is meant as in l. 1874, i.e., the supposed father of Sibrict. If in the original Gaimar MS. we had Sibrict in l. 1809 it is not easy to see how R could have confused it so thoroughly with Siebrant which would occur for the first and only time some sixty lines

later; on the other hand, if l. 1809 read Siebrant then the confusion can easily be understood. But where did Gaimar get his Siebrant? Certainly not from the Chronicle direct but from his conception of the events described there. Cyneheard and Sibrict are for him, it would seem, young men (cf. 'Kenehard out nun le dancel,' l. 1920, and 'Un frere aveit cil Siebriz, Ki Chenehart aveit a nun,' ll. 1838 f.) and also nephews to Cynewulf. Sibrict in his appeal to Cynewulf's men says:

> Vus savez ben si cum jo crei
> Ke sui fiz Siebrant le rei
> Si deusse par jugement
> Tenir le regne aveir la gent ll. 1873–6

indicating that his father was king before him. Gaimar's conception seems to be that Cynewulf robbed Sibrict of the succession (1815) but that he did not follow directly after Gudred; another king—the historical Sigebriht—reigned one year between:

> Dunc firent rei de sun [Gudred's] cusin
> Ke Siebrant aveit a nun
> Ne tint ke un an cel regiun ll. 1808–10

and this king was, according to Gaimar, Sibrict's father, Siebrant, whose name may be due to a recollection of the East Anglian prince Sigeheard, the connecting link being the Sigeberts and Sigeferths who figure in that genealogy. The result in Gaimar, though the author himself is far from being clear and consistent on the matter, seems to be briefly as follows. Gaimar renders the historical Sigebriht, who ascended the throne in 754 and reigned one year, by Siebrant; at his death the heir to the throne is Sibrict his son (on Gaimar's authority only) who is driven into exile—not killed as in the Chronicle—by Cynewulf, and it is this person who figures in the rest of the account.

Gaimar's mistake with regard to the alderman Cumbra, viz., that he rebelled against Cynewulf and was killed in hiding, is clearly set forth by Gross and calls for no further comment here. The account of the actual attack, which in the poem is far from being clear, is, it seems to me, wrongly interpreted by Gross as far as one or two details are concerned. In the A.S. Chronicle the account is briefly as follows. Cyneheard learns that the king is at Merton and surrounds the house before the king's followers are aware of the fact. The king defends himself and, after having recognised Cyneheard, attacks and severely wounds him, whereupon he is killed by the latter's men. Then the king's followers, attracted by the cries, appear on the scene, refuse Cyneheard's offer, and die fighting. The next morning some other royal

troops, in charge of Osric and Wiferth, hear of the king's death and ride over to Merton to avenge him. Cyneheard shuts the town-gates against them and offers them land if they will acknowledge him as king. This they refuse, attack the town, and succeed in killing Cyneheard.

Gaimar, however, having kept Sibrict alive, makes him take part in the vengeance and gets Cyneheard out of the way by letting him be killed by Cynewulf, who, in his turn, is killed by the former's companions. Then Sibrict appears, and with his followers accounts for the king's men, though in l. 1844 Gaimar says the king was 'sanz sa gent.' (Perhaps as this statement appears in rime it should not be pressed too far, and is meant to equal the 'lytle werode' of the A. S. Chronicle.) Then

La meisnee vindrent al cri
Ki od le rei ourent este
Kil aveit cheri e ame
Quant cil virent mort lur seignur
Al quer en ourent grant dolur
Donc ne voldreient pur ren leisser
Ke lur seignur nalgent venger
Sure lur corent sil ferirent
Cil vassalment les atendirent
Cil mult pramist e bel preia. ll. 1860–9

Gross takes 'la meisnee' to mean the 'lytle werode' and considers 'cil' in l. 1863 as meaning the men who were with Osric and Wiferth. But surely 'cil' refers to 'la meisnee' of l. 1860 and moreover there is no indication in Gaimar of their ('cil') coming on the following morning; on the contrary everything appears to take place on the same day.

Now however comes his difficulty: to whom does 'cil' in l. 1869 refer? At first sight to Sibrict, who is the last person mentioned by name. This is the view Gross finally accepts after carefully examining the speech which follows though he finds a stumbling block in the reference to Sibrict's father (l. 1874) since Gaimar has said nothing about Siebrant having been on the throne. When, however, Gross says this is 'die grösste Schwierigkeit für die Annahme, dass Sigebriht der Sprechende ist, denn er sagt ja hier anscheinend, dass er sein eigener Sohn ist,' it seems to me that he exaggerates the difficulty. It is in the first place quite natural that Sibrict should refer to his royal descent as a defence of his successful attack on Cynewulf; secondly Gross has given no ground for reading Sibrict in l. 1874. If however Siebrant be read in l. 1809, not Sibrict as Gross does, and interpreted as I have done above, then l. 1874 has some connection with the narrative, whereas otherwise it is either an apparent stupidity (Gross), or an almost meaningless

addition on the part of Gaimar. Further the objection to l. 1889, viz., that Sibrict did not actually kill Cynewulf, should not be pressed too far.

Finally the assumption that Siebrant and Sibrict are two distinct persons in Gaimar helps to clear up the obscurity in ll. 1907–8, where Gross too mentions the possibility of the supposed father of Sibrict being included under 'ces dous reis' of l. 1907, and the references in l. 1901 ('l'uncle ne les nevoz nel unt).

The fact that Gross is at fault (in my opinion) in the above details does not affect the general value of his work, which still remains indispensable to all who are interested in Gaimar.

Alexander Bell.

Leeds.

SOME NOTES ON THE PROBLEM OF THE 'LUDUS COVENTRIÆ.'

The interesting theory put forward by Miss M. H. Dodds in her article in the last January issue of *The Modern Language Review*, as to the composition of the Mystery Cycle known as the *Ludus Coventriæ* receives on some points confirmation from an examination of the MS. of the plays; some arguments, however, seem to be based on misleading features in the printed edition of Halliwell-Phillipps. The problem is, in fact, a more complicated one than appears from that edition.

i. The numbers attached to the plays—spoken of by Miss Dodds as 'Halliwell-Phillipps's numbering'—are found in the MS.; they are 'the divisions in the MS.' referred to by the editor, and are part of the original rubrication. Halliwell-Phillipps speaks of the divisions in the MS. as 'very incorrectly given,' but he accepts them in most cases. The numbers as given in the MS. are, in fact, incorrect. The number 17 is omitted altogether, the Adoration of the Shepherds being numbered 16 and the following play, the Adoration of the Magi, 18. Moreover, the numbers often indicate a division where the text is continuous. Thus the number 2 in the MS. breaks a stanza into two parts, and the number 28 comes in the middle of a speech. The numbers 33, 34 and 35 all occur in what is, as Miss Dodds points out, an unbroken scene.

Halliwell-Phillipps inserts the seventeen with the necessary subsequent alterations[1], but he does nothing to correct the other anomaly; the changes he makes are generally in the direction of still further breaking up the action, and they are additionally misleading in that they increase the discrepancy between the plays and the descriptions of the pageants in the proclamation. Thus the MS. number 2 stands at the point indicated in the proclamation, after the fall of Lucifer (p. 21); the MS. number 30 stands after the repentance of Peter (p. 298), separating the examination before Annas and Caiphas from the examination before

[1] His numbers are therefore one behind those in the MS. from 17 on, until by dividing the play marked 26 in the MS. into two (25, 26) he makes them the same.

Pilate as in the proclamation; the MS. number 32 stands before the lament of the women (p. 316), separating the trial and condemnation from the crucifixion as in the proclamation; the MS. number 35 stands before the speech of Anima Christi (p. 344), which corresponds with the opening of the XXXIII[1] pageant according to the proclamation. Thus in all these cases the original numbering follows more closely the divisions suggested in the proclamation.

The original numbering does not support Miss Dodds in making the thirteenth play begin with the speech of Contemplacio, but it affords corroborating evidence for the interpolation of the Purification play, in that before the 20[2] affixed to the following play (the Massacre of the Innocents) is the trace of an erased '1,' presumably for the 19, which would have been its number had it followed immediately on the Adoration of the Magi (No. 18[2]). It is probable that the Purification play was first intended to precede the Adoration of the Magi as No. 17 (the missing number). This is the order of the two incidents in the pseudo-gospel of the Birth of Mary.

ii. The proclamation shows traces of corrections intended to bring it into correspondence with the compilation of plays to which it is prefixed. The numbers of the pageants as first written ran in order from I to XI. The present irregular sequence is due to the correction of the original VIII to XIV to X to XVI, with the additional anomaly of inserting two X's and omitting XIII[3]. The erased numbers, except in the case of VIII, are quite clear in the MS. These corrections affect the group of 'Mary' plays, and support the view that a break in the cycle occurs after the seventh play, but they make the relation between the plays as compiled and the proclamation more complicated than has been assumed in the lucid analysis made by Miss Dodds. For it does not seem as if we had here to do with a simple expansion of the proclamation to correspond with an interpolation of a group of six new plays into an existing cycle, but with some revision of a compilation already containing a group of Mary plays.

It might be thought that the compiler first intended to take only a few plays from the group of which he afterwards incorporated the whole,

[1] The MS. here has XXIII by what is clearly a scribal slip.

[2] These are 19 and 17 respectively in H.-P.'s edition.

[3] Original numbering: The Betrothal of Mary two pageants, 8 and 9; Salutation and Conception 10; Return of Joseph 11; Trial of Joseph and Mary 12; Birth 13. Corrected numbering: The Betrothal of Mary two pageants, both 10; Salutation and Conception 11; Return of Joseph 12; Trial of Joseph and Mary 14; Birth 15. By these corrections the numbers 8 and 9 are left for the Barrenness of Anna, and Mary in the Temple plays, and the number 13 for the Visit to Elizabeth play.

altering the numbers of the proclamation as he changed his mind, but omitting to insert the stanzas relating to the extra plays, as he omitted to finish the correction of the numbers after XIV, and as he omitted to complete the stanzas for the XIV and XV pageants, though spaces are left in the MS. for the purpose.

There is, however, good ground for thinking that this is not the explanation of the discrepancy, but that we have here not one group but an amalgamation of two groups of Mary plays, that described in the proclamation and that described in the prologue of Contemplacio (p. 70): 'This matere here mad. is of þe modyr of mercy | how be joachym and anne. was here concepcion | sythe offred into þe temple. compiled breffly, | than maryed to joseph. and so folwyng þe salutacion | metyng with Elyzabeth. and þerwith a conclusyon.' From the one group the compiler took the Betrothal, Return of Joseph, Trial of Joseph and Mary plays; from the other the Barrenness of Anna, Mary in the Temple, Salutation and Conception, Visit to Elizabeth plays. An examination of the six plays grouped together by Miss Dodds as plays on the Girlhood of the Virgin suggests various reasons for doubting the homogeneity of the group. In the first place the play The Return of Joseph differs in tone from what may be called the 'Contemplacio' plays, resembling rather the less dignified Trial of Joseph and Mary and Birth plays. This play forms no part of Contemplacio's proclamation, in which the meeting with Elizabeth is announced as following immediately on the Salutation, as it does in the account given in the Protevangelion of St James; and it is not introduced as the others of the group are by a speech from Contemplacio. Moreover, the MS. gives some support for the view that this play is interpolated between the Salutation and the Visit to Elizabeth plays, for there is an indication first that the former play has not its original ending, and secondly that the part of Joseph in the latter play has been amplified in a way to link it with the Return of Joseph play.

First, after the chant with which the Salutation ends stands a cancelled stage direction: 'And þan Mary seyth,' a page and a half is then left blank, and Joseph's Return begins on a new quire. (2) On folio 73 b the three lines of Elizabeth's speech (p. 128): 'Come I pray 3ow specialy | j-wys 3e are welcome Mary | ffor þis comfortabelest comynge good god gramercy' are written (with a reference mark) at the bottom of the page, and after them as the name of the next speaker stands the word Contemplacio. If Contemplacio's speech were to follow on here, the speech of Joseph to Mary proposing their return

home and the leave-taking would be omitted, and thereby the inconsistency in the text as it stands between this leave-taking and Contemplacio's subsequent words: 'Mary *with* Elizabeth abod *þer* stylle | iij monthys fully as we rede' and 'whan all*e* was don our*e* lady fre | toke her*e* leve than after*e* this | at Elizabeth and at ȝakaree | and kyssyd joh*an* and gan hym blys' would be amended.

Again, the conversation of Joseph and Mary at the beginning of the Visit to Elizabeth comes before the introductory speech of Contemplacio, which has led Miss Dodds to suggest that it forms part of the conversation with which the preceding play The Return of Joseph concludes. But, as has already been pointed out, the MS. does not give support to this contention, for a blank half-page is left at the end of The Return of Joseph play, and the number 13 is affixed to this opening dialogue, which appears to have been added with the intention of connecting the action of the two plays. The two remaining speeches of Joseph in the Visit to Elizabeth belong respectively to these head- and end-link passages.

It might, therefore, be argued that the cancelled stage direction 'And þan Mary seyth' was affixed to a speech proposing The Visit to Elizabeth, and that on this speech followed, in the original 'Contemplacio' series, the speech of Contemplacio introducing the play of The Meeting of Mary and Elizabeth in which Joseph took little or no part.

Secondly, the Betrothal of Mary play as it stands is inconsistent with the preceding play, Mary in the Temple; for whereas in the latter Mary is represented as dwelling in the Temple, as in the account in the Protevangelion, in the former she is at home with her parents, and though she speaks of having been 'offryd to *þe* temple,' it is only in the sense of having been dedicated to the service of God. This is the situation suggested in the words of the proclamation: 'Than joachym and anne so mylde | þei brynge forthe mary *pat* blyssyd chylde'; while the other seems implied in Contemplacio's speech: 'Lo sofreynes her*e* ȝe have seyn | jn þe temple of our*e* ladyes presentac*i*on | she was nevyr occapyed jn thyngis veyn | but Evyr besy in holy ocupacyon.'

Again, the speech of Contemplacio with which this play, The Betrothal of Mary, appears to begin is in the MS. affixed to the close of the preceding play, and a blank half-page intervenes between it and the opening speech of Abysakar episcopus. This speech of Abysakar beginning: 'Lystenyth lordyng*i*s both hye and lowe' would form a natural introduction, and makes the speech of Contemplacio superfluous.

Some vacillation on the part of the compiler is shown in the numbering, 10 being affixed to the speech of Contemplacio and again to the speech of Abysakar.

The fact that the episcopus is here called Abysakar as in the Trial of Joseph and Mary play (Abizacker, p. 134), whereas in the Barrenness of Anna and Mary in the Temple plays he is Ysakare, is additional evidence that we have to do with different groups, and the Abysakar appears to represent the 'grete bushop Abyacar'[1] of the proclamation.

There is also some disturbance of the text of the Betrothal play that may disguise original features, and indicate some interpolation from another play on the subject—possibly the rejected play on the Marriage of Mary from the Contemplacio group (cf. prologue 'than maryed to joseph'). A passage containing part of the speech of Episcopus[2], in a different stanza form from the remainder, and the answer of a character, Minister, who appears with Mary in the Temple play, but is not otherwise introduced into the Betrothal play, and whose presence and counsel is not suggested in the proclamation, is found out of place, written on a preceding blank page; and the first dialogue of Joseph and the generaciones David is written in a later hand on an interpolated folio.

Thirdly the description of the Salutation and Conception play in the proclamation differs notably from the play as we have it. It omits all reference to the opening scene in heaven, the 'parlement of hefne' to which Contemplacio draws the attention of the audience, and it makes a point of the hearing of the angel's voice by Mary's three maidens. These damsels are assigned to Mary in the Betrothal play, two of them appear in the Return of Joseph play, but there is no mention of them in the Salutation and Conception play as it stands.

Other differences may be found between these plays supporting the view that they belong to two series. In the Contemplacio plays proper the use of the mid-line point is much more abundant, occurring here and there almost systematically for several lines in succession. In the Betrothal, Return and Trial plays it is found only occasionally. Again, many writers on the subject, from Hone onward, have pointed out the indebtedness of the writer of these plays to Bonaventura's *Meditationes Vitæ Christi*. This indebtedness, however, is confined to the Contem-

[1] The names Abiathar, Abiacar, Isacar etc. are given to the high priest of the Temple in different versions of the pseudo-gospels.

[2] 'This answere grettly trobelyth me.....Veni Creator spiritus' with the following stage direction.

placio group[1]; no borrowings are found in the Betrothal, Return or Trial plays, which appear to draw directly from the pseudo-gospels on the Birth of Mary.

There is, therefore, a certain amount of evidence for the theory that the writer of the proclamation had before him a series consisting of the Betrothal play in a slightly different form, divided into two parts; a Salutation and Conception play in which Susanna, Rebecca and Sephor appeared, not containing the preliminary scene in heaven; the Return of Joseph play, the Trial of Joseph and Mary play and the Birth play; and that the compiler had before him, as well as this, a similar Mary series adapted for separate representation, of which the prologue by Contemplacio gives the contents. Deciding to combine the two he altered the numbers of the pageants in the prologue, and made alterations in the plays, traces of some of which can be discerned, compressing the first part of the Betrothal play in view of the fuller treatment of Mary's youth in the preceding play, amplifying the part of Joseph in the Visit to Elizabeth play and so on. Fresh changes of purpose probably occurred during the transcription of the plays. Vacillations as to the choice and arrangement of material is shown in the double numbering of the Betrothal play in the text, in the cancelled stage direction of the Salutation and Conception play, in the inserted speeches in the Betrothal and the Visit to Elizabeth plays.

iii. The MS. in other ways throws light on discrepancies between the proclamation and the plays, and on the process of compilation. An examination of the external features of the MS. (watermarks, characteristics of handwriting and of rubrication, etc.) suggests that it is of a composite nature, and that it contains (besides the interpolated quire containing the Assumption play written in a different hand) two separate sections, written by the scribe at a different period, bound up as part of the compilation. These sections contain the first and second series of Passion plays, described as last and this year's performance by Contemplacio in his speech (p. 290), with the Descent from the Cross and beginning of the Resurrection play, and extend from f. 136 to f. 163 b, and from f. 164 to f. 189 b respectively, each section containing one or two interpolated folios. The first folio of each of these sections is worn and rubbed, shewing signs of having been an outside leaf, and f. 164 bears the signature of R. H. Dunelmensis and his Greek motto.

[1] The Purification play is also based on the *Meditationes*. It seems probable that the interpolation of this play and the interweaving of the Contemplacio series belong to the same stage of the compilation. It may incidentally be observed that the writer of these plays appears to have known Nicholas Love's translation of the *Meditationes*.

The first section ends with a blank folio followed by a folio containing the prologue of the doctors, a detached passage, not connected with any play or group of plays in the collection, and, it would appear, written for convenience on a handy blank sheet. The end of the second section is not so clear, the dovetailing in to the compilation having been more ingeniously accomplished by means of the removal and interpolation of folios; but internal concurs with external evidence to support the view that a break must have occurred at the close of the Passion plays, and that there is a join in the Burial, Harrowing and Resurrection series as it stands in the compilation, and that we have, therefore, this section with some interpolation and in truncated form.

It may thus be assumed that these Passion plays stand in the MS. as they were presented in separate groups, and not as they were adapted for presentation as part of a cycle. Hence the omission in both cases of the preliminary matter by the writer of the proclamation, describing them as part of the cycle he had in his mind, is accounted for. It will be observed that if this preliminary matter, made by Halliwell-Phillipps into separate plays, The Council of the Jews and King Herod, is omitted, the action follows smoothly on what has gone before, the Entry into Jerusalem (p. 252) on the close of the Nazarus play (p. 238), and the announcement of the taking of Jesus (p. 293) on Mary's lament (p. 287).

Very interesting evidence as to the method of compilation is given in connection with the beginning of the Entry into Jerusalem play. In the MS. at the close of the council of Annas and Cayphas (p. 251) stands a cancelled passage consisting of the stage direction, 'Here enteryth þe apostel petyr and johan þe euangelyst with hym petyr seyng,' and the first six lines of the speech beginning: 'O ȝe pepyl. dyspeyryng be glad,' which comes in the play as it now is after the incident of the sending for the ass and her foal; and the following folio containing this incident and these six opening lines of Peter's speech is an interpolated leaf. This interpolation leads to inconsistency—the first four lines of Jesus' speech beginning 'ffrendys be holde þe tyme of mercy' are repeated later (pp. 252 and 256), and Peter and John 'abyden stylle' and yet advance with the procession—but its purpose seems to be to link the action of the Entry and the Lazarus plays, and perhaps to amplify the Palm Sunday incident in accordance with the proclamation.

The incident of Mary Magdalen, which, Miss Dodds notes, is not mentioned in the proclamation, occurs also in a small interpolated quire

(f. 149 to f. 151 b), and the MS. suggests some wavering on the part of the compiler as to its insertion. After Leyon's speech (p. 263, bottom of f. 148 b) Halliwell-Phillipps gives the stage direction 'Here Judas Caryoth comyth into the place.' But in the MS. this direction with the word 'Jhesus' as the name of the next speaker is crossed through, and three alternative catchwords are given, the two not used being also crossed through: 'As a cursyd,' the beginning of Mary Magdalen's (the next) speech; 'My hert is ryth,' the beginning of Jesus' speech after the Magdalen incident (f. 150); 'now cownterfedyd' the beginning of Judas' speech (f. 152). The use of this last, which belongs to the cancelled stage direction, would entail the omission of the interpolated quire. There are, as has been said, other interpolated folios in the Harrowing and Burial play, besides those in different handwriting earlier in the compilation (quire E, ff. 51 and 52 and separate folios 95, 96 and 112), and the whole question of the composition of the MS. and its relation to the compilation of the plays is a complicated one.

iv. An examination of the MS., moreover, makes clear that the compilation was subsequently used for acting purposes, and that different groups were selected for performance.

One or two stage directions are found scribbled in the margin in a later hand: 'Go homwardis' (f. 102) against the speech of Primus Miles in the Massacre of the Innocents play (p. 182); 'here goth he his way' (f. 129) after the speech of the Quartus Consolator and Nuncius in the Lazarus play (p. 226).

Occasionally the name of a character is written in the same way just before his first speech, as if to indicate his entry: so Pastores (f. 39 b) in the Barrenness of Anna play, so Angelus (f. 101) in the Massacre of the Innocents play.

On f. 144 b against the name of the speaker Primus Ciues de Jher*usalem* is a later note: 'here entrith þe fyrste pr*o*phete,' and on f. 145 in the bottom margin is a similar note: 'here entrith þe p*ar*te of þe II^{de} pr*o*phete.' This suggests some duplication of rôles, which is also suggested by the substitution in similar marginal notes (f. 140 b and f. 141) of the names Annas and Cayfas for Primus and Secundus Doctor (p. 247); and it points also to the combination of this group of Passion plays with a Prophet play, though apparently not the one found in this compilation.

Again, in the Harrowing play additions are made to the text, in the hand of the scribe of the inserted ff. 95, 96 and 112, of a kind to suggest

that the writer is supplementing this copy of the play for acting purposes from another fuller version. On f. 185 b, affixed to the stage direction: 'The sowle goth to helle gatys' etc. (p. 330), stands the note: 'Nota *anima* latron*is*,' which seems to indicate the introduction of a speech of this character. After the speech of Abraham on f. 191 b (p. 345) the words '*Anima* Caym' are written in both margins, and on the left-hand margin an erased note follows, presumably giving directions for the insertion of an extra speech, as it ends with the words 'fayere frendes,' which form the opening of the next speech in the text. On f. 192 before the next speech of Anima Christi (p. 346) are some notes which indicate a prolongation of the dispute between Anima Christi and the inhabitants of hell. They run as follows: 'Nota *þe* devylle. Thought many be gon I am glad etc. thens I wyll þe bere | *þan* Crist. And *þan* Cayme xalle sey his spech | and *þan* Crist xalle sey | now ys your foo'— these last words forming the opening of the speech in the text.

Belonging to a somewhat similar revision by the same hand are additions to the Three Maries play, in which eight new lines are substituted for four lines in the speech of Mary Magdalen and four in the speech of Mary Jacobi (f. 197 b, p. 357), the alteration being intended to harmonize the text, which follows St Mark, with the account of the appearance to the women found in St Matthew. There are found also throughout the earlier part of the MS. corrections of dialectal or archaic forms such as might naturally be undertaken if the plays were to be acted at a later period. These corrections are in different hands and are for the most part alterations of single words here and there, but some of more importance are from the reviser who contributed ff. 96, 97 and 112, and occur in the group of plays, the Adoration of the Shepherds, the Adoration of the Magi and the Massacre of the Innocents, of which ff. 96 and 97 form part. Some lines in the speeches of Tertius pastor (f. 89, p. 157) and of Herod (f. 93, p. 163) are practically rewritten, as a comparison of the speech of the former in the original (*a*) and revised (*b*) forms will show:

(*a*) Thow I make lyty noyse
I am an herde *þat* hattyht moyse
I herde carpynge of a croyse
Of moyses in his lawe
Of a mayd a barne be born.
et seq.

(*b*) Thow I make lytyl noyse of þis
I am an herde man *þat* hattyht sayyng amys
I herde spekyng of a child of blis
Of moyses in his lawe
Of a mayd a child xuld be born.
et seq.

One further indication of the later representation of some group of these plays may perhaps be found in the MS. on f. 196, where, at the

beginning of the Three Maries play, the words 'Finem 1ª die' are written in the margin. They are not, however, very clear.

v. Lastly the MS. affords some evidence of the ecclesiastical origin of the compilation. Halliwell-Phillipps records the marginal notes on the size of the ark, and the dates of the creation of Adam and the deaths of Mary Magdalen and St Joseph (f. 74 b), but he omits to note the genealogies of Adam and Noah with which the margins of ff. 16b, 17, 17b, 18; 21, 21b, 22, 22b are filled, the table of the family relationships of the Virgin (f. 37) containing information beyond that found in the usual mediaeval sources, and the note on the five Annes of importance in Scripture history (f. 37 b). Such marginalia confirm the evidence of the general character of the plays, which suggests an ecclesiastical rather than a civic origin.

Miss Dodds' analysis and comparison of the plays and the proclamation establishes convincingly what ten Brink has called the 'sehr gemischten Charakter' of this compilation; but the theory that it consists of the civic cycle of N-town filled out by additions or substitutions of groups belonging to craft guilds of other places, would seem to require strong evidence to support it, in face of the contrast which this compilation offers to the known civic cycles in the markedly non-popular and often definitely theological treatment of the themes.

Again, the validity of the criterion applied by Miss Dodds to distinguish the 'N-town plays' from the additions may be questioned; the argument that the proclamation of plays that shall be 'of holy wrytte | And of no fablys be no way' would exclude plays based on the apocryphal gospels presupposes more critical discrimination than would be found in a 15th century audience. And the questions of the dove-tailing of the different groups to form the series, and of the relation of the compilation to the proclamation, seem to require more minute examination.

Moreover, that the cycle comprises a number of groups, that the MS. itself is in part made up of separate portions containing distinct groups, that the plays continued apparently to be used in separate groups—if this conclusion may be drawn from the modernizing revision of the Shepherds, Magi and Massacre plays—that the compiler and the later reviser had both alternative versions of the plays to draw from, all these facts give support to the theory that these plays formed part of the repertory of some body of actors of clerical character, who gave yearly performances of plays in connection with different festivals of the Church, a body similar to, though perhaps more ambitious than, the

'pleyers' (seventeen in number) who presented the Candelmas play in honour of St Anne, having the year before given the Adoration of the Shepherds and the Magi, and proposing to give the Disputation in the following year. Dr Thomas Smith, cataloguing the MSS. of the plays in 1696, corrects James's mistake as to the New Testament contents and rejects the titles 'Ludus Coventriæ sive ludus corporis Christi,' but he keeps the ascription of the plays to the 'fratres mendicantes.'

K. S. Block.

Englefield Green.

WALPOLE AND THE 'MÉMOIRES DE GRAMMONT.'

The admirers of the *Mémoires de Grammont* have been many, but nobody loved the memoirs and the age they describe as Horace Walpole did. 'I know all that can be told me about the periods I delight in,' he says. 'I can scarce read Grammont and Madame de Sévigné because I know them by heart[1].' The Englishman, with his knowledge of the French language and literature, was eminently fitted to appreciate this French masterpiece written by an Englishman, and recalling events which an Englishman only could fully understand and enjoy.

Walpole refers to the Memoirs constantly; his correspondence is full of allusions to the incidents familiar to all readers of the Memoirs. One Lady Betty Smithson appears at a subscription masquerade with a 'pyramid of baubles' on her head; Walpole is irresistibly reminded of the Princess of Babylon in Grammont[2]. A conversation takes place between Lady Greenwich and Lady Tweeddale; Lady Greenwich mentions the Saxons. 'The Saxons, my dear, who were they?' 'Lord, Madam, did your ladyship never read the History of England?' 'No, my dear, pray who wrote it?'—'Don't it put you in mind of Matta and the Allobroges in Grammont?' is Walpole's comment[3].

A curious little incident links him with one of the personages of the Memoirs. Once, when Walpole was a boy, there came to see his mother at Chelsea one of the fair ladies of the court of Charles II, 'la belle' Jennings, no longer now in the radiance of her famous beauty, but a needy Jacobite, anxious to obtain a pension through Lady Walpole's influence. 'Her eyes being dim and she full of flattery,' says Walpole annotating his copy of the Memoirs, 'she commended the beauty of the prospect, but unluckily the room in which they sat looked only against the garden wall[4].'

A man cannot know a book by heart without falling under its influence in some way or other. When one reads Walpole's *Memoirs of the Reign of George the Third*, one is occasionally reminded of the

[1] *Letters*, 1903–1905; 16 vols., IX, p. 127.
[2] *Ib.*, II, p. 372.
[3] *Ib.*, XIV, p. 75.
[4] Austin Dobson, *Horace Walpole, a Memoir*, London, 1910, p. 8.

manner of Hamilton. Certain portraits recall those which abound in the Grammont Memoirs; the following one may serve as an example, at the same time it will show how far the imitation, conscious or unconscious, falls short of the model. 'The Countess of Northumberland was a jovial heap of contradictions. The blood of all the Percies and Seymours swelled in her veins and in her fancy; while her person was more vulgar than anything but her conversation, which was larded indiscriminately with stories of her ancestors and her footmen. Shows and crowds and junketting were her endless pursuits. She was familiar with the mob, while stifled with diamonds; and yet was attentive to the most minute privileges of her rank while almost shaking hands with a cobbler....She was mischievous under an appearance of frankness; generous and friendly, without delicacy or sentiment[1].'

But while Walpole had an infinite admiration for the grace of the *Mémoires de Grammont*, he did not so unreservedly admire the spirit in which they were written. He admitted that Hamilton was superior to the indelicacy of the Stuart court; at the same time he pointed out that he was so overborne by its prejudices 'that he had the complaisance to ridicule virtue, merit, talents[2].'

Gradually there grew up in his mind the resolution to bring out a new edition of the Memoirs. He first mentions his purpose in a letter of 1751[3]; it would seem however that the plan had originated long before this. His edition was to have 'notes, and cuts of the principal beauties and heroes' if he was successful, as he hoped he would be, in discovering all their portraits[4]. He set himself first of all to 'make out all the people at all remarkable[5],' annotated his edition of the Memoirs[6] and made out an 'Index of Remarkable Persons.' He found some difficulty in identifying 'My Lord Janet,' but ultimately decided that he must be one of the Thanets and his rectification has been accepted in all subsequent editions of the Memoirs, though 'Janet' is a misprint for 'Jaret' which in turn is a misspelling for 'Gerard[7].'

[1] *Memoirs of the Reign of George III*, 1845, 4 vols., vol. I, p. 419.
[2] *Catalogue of Engravers* (octavo edition), p. 135.
[3] *Letters*, III, p. 63. [4] *Ib.* [5] *Ib.*
[6] Walpole's copy of the Memoirs was the 1746 edition published at Paris. This annotated copy was sold in May 1902 by Messrs Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge to Mr Denham of Russell Square for £53 (*Book Prices Current*, 1902, pp. 458–9). Mr Denham has unfortunately removed to America. I have therefore been unable to trace this copy any further.
[7] *Letters*, III, p. 63. 'Jaret' and not 'Janet' is given in the MS. copy of the Memoirs at the Bibliothèque Mazarine, and 'Jaret' is the spelling adopted for 'Gerard' by the French Ambassadors; see, for instance, Cominges' letters in vol. 79, *Correspondance Politique d'Angleterre, Affaires Etrangères*. The stories that Cominges relates about 'Madame Jaret' are to be found in Pepys, where, of course, Madame Jaret figures as My Lady Gerard.

The 'philosophe Whitnell' puzzled him for long, but at length he discovered the original. 'What do you think his real name was?—only Whetenhall. Look in Collin's Baronets and under the article Bedingfield you will find that he was an ingenious gentleman, and la blanche Whitnell, "though one of the greatest beauties of the age, an excellent wife".' 'I am persuaded,' adds Walpole with delight, 'the Bedingfields crowded in these characters to take off the ridicule in Grammont. They have succeeded to a miracle[1].'

The 'hunting' of the portraits took up much of his time. 'I am Grammont mad,' he said of himself[2]. He went to sales in the hope of finding some long sought-for favourite; he visited old country houses, for the sake of the treasures they might contain, going out of his way on one occasion to climb up to Summer Hill, to make a drawing of the residence of the princess of Babylon[3]. The 'rage of Grammont' carried him to 'old Malbro's at Wimbledon' to see a charming picture of Lady Denham[4]; in a 'purgatory of antiquities' at Woburn he found 'le vieux Roussel qui était le plus fier danseur d'Angleterre[5]'; Sir George Lyttelton's house, though 'immeasurably bad and old,' contained pictures 'extremely agreeable' to Walpole for their relation to Grammont, 'le sérieux' Lyttelton, Miss Stuart, Lord Brouncker and Lady Southesk[6]. Portraits of Harry Jermyn and Chiffinch were bought in 1755[7]. A Lady Kingsland in Dublin, he heard, possessed a picture of Madame de Grammont. 'I don't know who Lady Kingsland is, whether rich or poor,' he writes to his friend George Montague, 'but I know there is nothing I would not give for such a picture. I wish you would hunt it, and if the dame is above temptation, do try if you could obtain a copy in water colours, if there is anybody in Dublin could execute it[8].' Montague found not only this portrait by Petitot but also a younger one by Lely, and Walpole decided to have a copy in enamel of the latter. 'I would fain resist this copy,' he says. 'I would more fain excuse myself for having it. I say to myself, it would be rude not to have it, now Lady Kingsland and Mr Montague have had so much trouble.—Well, I think I must have it[9].'

In 1765 the belongings of the comte de Caylus were put up for auction, and Walpole hastening to Paris bought 'half of it for a song[10].'

[1] *Letters*, III, p. 64.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 71.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 112, and Mrs Paget Toynbee's note.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 64.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 71.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 185.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 309.
[8] *Ib.*, vol. v, p. 165. One of the daughters of George Hamilton and la belle Jennings had married a Viscount Kingsland.
[9] *Ib.*, p. 182.
[10] *Ib.*, p. 364.

This was felicity indeed, but better things were yet in store. 'Oh Madam, Madam, Madam,' he writes to Lady Hervey, 'what do you think I have found since I wrote my Letter this morning? I am out of my wits! Never was anything like my luck, it never forsakes me! I have found Count Grammont's picture! I went to the Grands Augustins to see the picture of the reception of the Knights of the Holy Ghost: they carried me into a chamber full of their portraits; I was looking for Bassompierre; my laquais de louage opened a door and said "Here are more." It is old, not at all handsome, but has a great deal of finesse in the countenance. I shall think of nothing now but having it copied. If I had seen or done nothing else, I should be content with my journey hither[1].' For fifteen years he had been in search of a portrait of Grammont and had always been assured that there was none in existence.

Strawberry Hill was full of his Grammont souvenirs—portraits of Catherine of Braganza, of the Earl of Ormonde, Arabella Churchill by Lely and 'Backstairs Chiffinch' by Riley, miniatures of Mrs Middleton and Miss Temple, a bust of the elder Jermyn, etc. In the great North Bed Chamber hung portraits of the Countess of Chesterfield by Lely, the Countess de Grammont by Eckardt, a companion picture to one of Mlle de la Vallière, and a copy of la belle Jennings by Milbourn; in the Green Closet there was a portrait in oil of George Hamilton and, finally, in the Blue Breakfast Room—Walpole's constant and chosen apartment—there was to be found a portrait of the comte de Grammont 'in an elegant carved frame,' and a portrait—one wonders which one—of Anthony Hamilton[2].

In 1772, at last, there was issued from the 'Officina Arbuteana' the famous Strawberry Hill edition of the *Mémoires de Grammont*. The editor had spent more than twenty years in collecting material for his notes and bringing together the portraits, but in the end, 'hindered by insuperable difficulties,' he gave in his edition only the portraits of Elizabeth Hamilton, Anthony Hamilton and the Comte de Grammont. He wanted to include also those of George Hamilton and la belle Jennings, and one of Anthony Hamilton in his youth, but he was unable to obtain the necessary permission from the family in whose possession they were at the time[3]. Besides the 'Avis de l'Editeur' from Walpole's

[1] *Letters*, III, p. 361.

[2] *Catalogue of the Sale of valuable Contents of Strawberry Hill*, Monday, April 25th, 1842, pp. 203, 204, 113, 114, 183; Allan Fea, Introduction to his edition of the *Memoirs*, 1906, *passim*; Pinkerton, *Walpoliana*, 1786, 2 vols., I, p. xli.

[3] 'Avis de l'Editeur' in the Strawberry Hill edition.

pen, this edition contains a very short account of Hamilton's life which appears in most early editions of the *Mémoires de Grammont*, from 1731 downwards. Walpole probably copied it from the 1746 edition which he possessed, but, as he does not state this fact, the sketch has often been attributed to him[1]. The notes are not all equally valuable, and in some cases are even incorrect[2].

The edition was dedicated to one who was well able to appreciate the Memoirs.

A
Madame .....
l'Editeur vous consacre cette edition,
comme un monument de son Amitié,
de son Admiration & de son Respect; à
vous dont les Graces, l'Esprit & le Goût
retracent au siecle present le siecle de Louis
quatorze & les Agremens de l'Auteur de
ces Memoires.

Madame ..... is, of course, no other than Madame du Deffand. Walpole had sent her his Preface and the Dedication, and at his desire she had corrected mistakes in spelling and had altered the style. It was at her special request, though, that her name did not appear in the 'Dedicace,' as Walpole had intended it should[3].

One hundred copies only of the book were printed, not because Walpole intended this edition for his friends alone—'who would have an hundred?' he asks—but because he did not wish to make his favourite book common[4]. Of the hundred copies twenty-five were sent to France, where, besides Madame du Deffand, the following friends and acquaintances were remembered: Mmes de Choiseul, de Luxembourg, de Lauzun, de Boufflers, de Boisgelin, de Cambis, de la Vallière, de Chatillon, de Sanadon, de Jonzac, M. and Mme Trudaine, the bishop of Mirepoix, the abbé Barthélemy, the comte de Caraman, Pont de Veyle and a certain M. Francès[5].

In 1783 Walpole had his edition reprinted by Dodsley, but naturally the reprint is far from having the value and the interest of the original Strawberry Hill edition. The Dedication remains the same except for the heading, which runs thus:

[1] E.g., Sayons, *Histoire de la Littérature française à l'Étranger* (1861, 2 vols.), II, pp. 368, 372.

[2] E.g., on page 272 where Walpole, one does not quite see how, confuses George and Anthony Hamilton. He admits later on that he has gone wrong. 'I find that in the notes to the Strawberry Hill edition of the *Mémoires de Grammont* I have fallen into some mistakes for want of a proper genealogy of the Abercorn family' (*Walpoliana*, II, p. 7).

[3] Madame du Deffand, *Lettres* (1912, 3 vols.), II, p. 380.

[4] Walpole, *Letters*, VIII, p. 226.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 224, du Deffand, II, *passim*.

A
Madame
Marie de Vichi
Marquise du Deffand.

Madame du Deffand had begged Walpole not to name her in any new edition of the Memoirs, 'on croirait que, mécontente de ce que l'on ne m'a pas dévinée, j'ai obtenu que vous me fissiez connaître[1],' but as this reprint appeared three years after Madame du Deffand's death, Walpole was no longer bound by her objections, and no one can blame him for wishing to honour the memory of his old friend.

RUTH CLARK.

WATFORD.

[1] du Deffand, II, p. 469.

DANTE'S LETTER TO THE EMPEROR HENRY VII (*EPIST.* VII): CRITICAL TEXT.

The Latin text of this letter has been preserved in three MSS., two of the fourteenth century (*Cod. Vaticano-Palatino Latino* 1729, in the Vatican; and *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8, in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome), and one of the fifteenth (*Cod. Marciano Latino* XIV. 115, in the Biblioteca Marciana at Venice). Transcripts of these three texts were published by me in three previous articles in this *Review* (Vol. VII, pp. 6–12, 209–14, 434–40). There exist also two early Italian translations of this letter, one certainly, and the other probably, of the fourteenth century; the first of these, which has been preserved in the above mentioned *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8, was printed by me recently, for the first time, in this *Review* (Vol. IX, pp. 332–43); the other, which was at one time attributed to Marsilio Ficino (1433—1499), has been preserved in at least ten MSS., two probably of the fourteenth century, the rest of the fifteenth[1], and has been many times printed[2].

The MSS. and printed editions referred to in the *apparatus criticus* which accompanies the subjoined critical text are indicated as follows:

For the Latin text (MSS.), Vat. = Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat. 1729; Pant[1]. = Cod. S. Pantaleo 8; Ven. = Cod. Marciano Lat. XIV. 115; (printed editions), W[1]. = Witte (1827)[3]; F[1]. = Fraticelli (1840)[4]; T. = Torri (1842)[5]; F[2]. = Fraticelli (1857)[6]; G. = Giuliani (1882)[7]; O[1]. = Oxford Dante (1894); O[2]. = do. (1897); O[3]. = do. (1904); O. = do. (all three editions)[8]; W[1].-O. = W[1].F[1].T.F[2].G.O.

[1] See P. Wagner, *Die Echtheit der drei Kaiserbriefe Dantes*, pp. 10–11.
[2] See *Mod. Lang. Rev.* VII, 4–5.
[3] *Dantis Alligherii Epistolae quae exstant*, Patavii, 1827 (*Epist.* VI, pp. 30–46).
[4] *Dantis Alighierii Epistolae quae exstant*, Florentiae, 1840 (*Epist.* III, pp. 230–49).
[5] *Epistole di Dante Alighieri edite e inedite*, Livorno, 1842 (*Epist.* VII, pp. 52–60).
[6] *Opere Minori di Dante*, Firenze, 1857 (Ed. 1893, Vol. III, *Epist.* VII, pp. 464–74).
[7] *Opere Latine di Dante*, Firenze, 1882 (Vol. II, *Epist.* VII, pp. 22–6).
[8] *Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri*, Oxford, 1894, 1897, 1904 (*Epist.* VII, pp. 409–11).

For the Italian texts (MS.), Pant². = Cod: S. Pantaleo 8; (printed editions), D¹. = Doni (1547)[1]; D². = Doni (1552)[2]; B. = Biscioni (1723)[3]; M. = Moutier (1823)[4]; W². = Witte (1827)[5].

For convenience of reference the numbering of the sections [in square brackets] and of the lines (in round brackets) of the text as printed in the Oxford Dante has been inserted in the critical text.

Epistola vii.

Gloriosissimo atque felicissimo Triumphatori[6] et Domino singulari, Domino Henrico, divina providentia Romanorum Regi, et semper[7] Augusto, devotissimi sui Dantes Alagherii[8], Florentinus et exul immeritus, ac universaliter omnes Tusci qui pacem desiderant terrae, osculum ante pedes[9].

[§ 1.] Immensa Dei dilectione testante, (2) relicta nobis est[10] pacis hereditas, ut in (3) sua mira dulcedine militiae nostrae dura (4) mitescerent, et in usu eius patriae (5) triumphantis[11] gaudia mereremur. At livor (6) antiqui et implacabilis hostis, humanae (7) prosperitati semper et latenter[12] insidians, (8) nonnullos exheredando volentes ob tutoris (9) absentiam nos[13] alios impie[14] denudavit[15] (10) invitos. Hinc diu super[16] flumina con-(11)-fusionis deflevimus, et patrocinia iusti (12) regis incessanter[17] implorabamus[18], qui[19] (13) satellitium saevi tyranni disperderet, et (14) nos in nostra iustitia reformaret. Quum-(15)-que tu, Caesaris et Augusti successor, (16) Apennini iuga transiliens, veneranda (17) signa Tarpeia[20] retulisti, protinus longa (18) substiterunt suspiria, lacrymarumque (19) diluvia[21] desierunt; et, ceu[22] Titan praeoptatus[23] (20) exoriens, nova spes Latio saeculi melioris (21) effulsit.

[1] *Prose Antiche di Dante, Petrarcha, et Boccaccio*, Fiorenza, 1547 (pp. 9–12).
[2] *La Zucca del Doni*, Vinegia, 1551–2 ('I Frutti,' pp. 69–73).
[3] *Prose di Dante Alighieri e di Messer Gio. Boccacci*, Firenze, 1723 (pp. 211–15).
[4] *La Cronica di Giovanni Villani*, Firenze, 1823 (Vol. VIII, pp. lxv–lxxi).
[5] *Dantis Allighierii Epistolae quae extant*, Patavii, 1827 (*Epist.* VI, pp. 31–47).
[6] So Pant¹.; Ven. W¹.–O. *Sanctissimo T.*; Pant². D¹.D².B.M.W². *Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo trionfatore*; the title is wanting in Vat.
[7] So Pant¹.; Ven. W¹.–O. omit *et*; Pant².D¹.D².B.M.W². *et sempre.*
[8] So Pant¹.; Ven. *Aldigherrj*; W¹.F¹.T.F². *Allighierius*; G. *Allagherius*; O. *Aligherius.*
[9] So Pant¹. Ven.; W¹.–O. *osculantur pedes.*
[10] So Pant¹. Ven. W¹.–O.; Vat. *est nobis.* [11] Ven. *triumphis.*
[12] So Pant¹. W¹.–O.; Vat. *latanter*; Ven. *conlatenter.* [13] Vat. *non.*
[14] So Pant¹. Ven. W¹.F¹.; Vat. *impios*; T.F².G.O. *impius*; Pant². D¹.D².B.M.W². *crudelmente.*
[15] Pant¹. *denudare.* [16] Ven. *semper.* [17] Vat. *incensanter.*
[18] So Vat. Pant¹. T.F².G.O.; Ven. W¹.F¹. *imploravimus*; Pant². *pregauamo*; D¹.D².B.M. *addomandiamo*; W². *addomandammo.*
[19] Ven. *et qui.*
[20] Ven. *turpia.* [21] Ven. *diluuię.* [22] W¹.F¹. *quasi.*
[23] So Pant¹. Vat. G.; Ven. W¹.F¹. *praecipitatus*; T.F².O. *peroptatus*; Pant². *innançi desiato*; D¹.D².B.M.W². *molto desiderato.*

Tunc plerique vota sua prae-(22)-venientes in iubilo, tam Saturnia regna (23) quam Virginem redeuntem cum Marone (24) cantabant.

[§ 2.] (25) Verum quia sol noster (sive desiderii (26) fervor hoc submoneat[1], sive facies veritatis) (27) aut morari iam[2] creditur[3], aut retrocedere (28) supputatur[4], quasi Iosue denuo, vel Amos (29) filius imperaret, incertitudine[5] dubitare (30) compellimur, et in vocem Praecursoris (31) irrumpere[6] sic: 'Tu es qui venturus es, (32) an alium expectamus?' Et quamvis (33) longa sitis in dubium quae sunt[7] certa (34) propter esse propinqua, ut adsolet, furi-(35)-bunda deflectat: nihilominus in te credi-(36)-mus et speramus, asseverantes te Dei (37) ministrum[8], et Ecclesiae filium, et Romanae (38) gloriae promotorem. Nam[9] et ego, qui (39) scribo tam pro me quam pro aliis, velut[10] (40) decet imperatoriam maiestatem, benignis-(41)-simum vidi et clementissimum te audivi, (42) quum pedes tuos manus meae tractarunt, (43) et labia mea debitum persolverunt. Tunc[11] (44) exultavit in me[12] spiritus meus, quum[13] tacitus (45) dixi mecum: 'Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui (46) tollit[14] peccata mundi!'

[§ 3.] (47) Sed quid[15] tam sera moretur segnities (48) admiramur. Quando[16] iamdudum in (49) valle victor Eridani, non secus[17] Tusciam (50) derelinquis[18], praetermittis et negligis, (51) quam si[19] iura[20] tutanda[21] imperii circumscribi (52) Ligurum[22] finibus arbitreris; non prorsus (53) (ut suspicamur) advertens[23], quoniam Ro-(54)-manorum gloriosa potestas[24] nec metis Italiae, nec (55) tricornis[25] Europae margine

[1] So Pant[1]. Vat. W[1].–O.; Ven. *submoueat*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.W[2]. *ammonisca*; M. *monisca*.
[2] W[1].F[1]. *te jam*. [3] W[1].F[1]. *credunt*. [4] W[1].F[1]. *supputant*; G. *suspicatur*.
[5] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].F[1].F[2].G.O.; Vat. T. *in certitudine*; Pant[2]. *ne la certecça*; D[1].D[2].B.M. *nella certitudine*; W[2]. *nella incertitudine*.
[6] W[1].F[1]. *erumpere*. [7] F[1]. *erant*.
[8] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].–O.; Vat. *te ministrum*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *te essere ministro di Dio*.
[9] T. omits *Nam*. [10] Ven. *uel*; W[1]. *ut*; F[1]. *veluti*.
[11] So Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].F[1]. *cum* (*quum*); Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *quando*.
[12] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].T.; F[1].F[2].G.O. *in te*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *in me*.
[13] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1]. (*quum*); T.F[2].G.O. *et*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].M.W[2]. *quando*; B. omits.
[14] So Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1].; Pant[1]. *tollis*; T.F[2].O. *abstulit*; Pant[2]. *tolle*; D[1].D[2].M.W[2]. *tollit*; B. omits.
[15] F[1]. *quia*; T. *quae*.
[16] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1].; T.F[2].G.O. *quoniam*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *quando*.
[17] W[1].F[1]. omit *non secus*.
[18] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. T.F[2].G.O.; W[1].F[1]. *derelinquens*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *abbandoni*.
[19] W[1].F[1]. *quasi*. [20] Pant[1]. *vita*.
[21] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *tuendi*.
[22] So Vat. Ven. T.F[2].G.O.; Pant[1]. *ligineranj*; W[1].F[1]. *Liguriae*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *Lombardia*.
[23] Pant[1]. *aduerteris*.
[24] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven.; W[1].–O. *Romanorum potestas*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *la gloriosa signoria delli Romani*.
[25] Ven. *iricornis*.

coarctatur. (56) Nam etsi vim passa in[1] angustum[2] guber-(57)-nacula sua contraxerit[3], undique[4] tamen (58) de inviolabili iure fluctus Amphitritis (59) attingens[5], vix ab inutili unda Oceani se (60) circumcingi dignatur. Scriptum etenim (61) nobis est[6]:

(62) 'Nascetur pulcra Troianus origine Caesar,
(63) Imperium[7] Oceano, famam qui terminet astris.'

(64) Et quum universaliter orbem describi (65) edixisset Augustus (ut bos noster evan-(66)-gelizans, accensus ignis aeterni flamma[8], (67) remugit[9]), si non de iustissimi principatus (68) aula prodiisset[10] edictum, Unigenitus Dei (69) Filius, homo factus[11] ad profitendum[12] secun-(70)-dum naturam assumptam edicto[13] se sub-(71)-ditum, nequaquam tunc[14] nasci de Virgine (72) voluisset. Non enim suasisset iniustum[15], (73) quem omnem iustitiam implere decebat[16].

[§ 4.] (74) Pudeat itaque in angustissima[17] mundi (75) area irretiri[18] tam diu[19], quem mundus omnis (76) expectat; et ab Augusti[20] circumspectione (77) non defluat, quod Tuscana tyrannis in (78) dilationis fiducia confortatur, et[21] quotidie (79) malignantium cohortando[22] superbiam, (80) vires novas accumulat, temeritatem (81) temeritati adiciens. Intonet iterum[23] vox[24] (82) illa Curionis in Caesarem:

(83) 'Dum trepidant nullo firmatae[25] robore partes,
(84) Tolle moras; semper nocuit[26] differre paratis:
(85) Par labor atque metus[27] pretio maiore petuntur.'

[1] Vat. T. *non.*
[2] Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. T. *Augustum*; W[1].F[1].F[2].G.O. *angustum*; Pant[2]. *strectecça.*
[3] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *contraxit.*
[4] W[1].–O. punctuate *contraxerit undique*; but both Pant[1]. and Ven. begin a fresh sentence with *undique* (see Parodi, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. XIX, 253–4).
[5] Vat. *attigens.*
[6] So Pant[1]. T.F[2].G.O.; Vat. *Scriptum etenim uobis est*; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *Scriptum est enim nobis*; Pant[2]. *Impercio chele scripto a noi*; D[1].D[2].B.W[2]. *egli è scritto*; M. *è scritto.*
[7] Pant[1]. *Imperij.*
[8] So Pant[1]. Vat. F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1].T. *ignis flamma*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *la fiamma dello eterno fuoco.*
[9] Pant[1]. *remigit.*
[10] So Vat. Ven. W[1].–O.; Pant[1]. *prodisset*; Pant[2]. *auesse deuulgato*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *avesse aperto.*
[11] Ven. *homo factus qui.* [12] Ven. *proficendum.* [13] Ven. *edicit.*
[14] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1].(W[1].F[1]. *tum*); T.F[2].G.O. *nunquam tunc*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *non...allora.*
[15] Pant[1]. *in iustum.*
[16] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *qui omnem justitiam implere debebat*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *al quale si conviene* (Pant[2]. *se conuenea*; W[2]. *si convenne*) *adempiere ogni giustizia.*
[17] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *angusta*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *strettissima.*
[18] Ven. *metiri.*
[19] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven.; W[1].–O. *tamdiu* (see Parodi, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. XIX, 254).
[20] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *Augusta.* [21] Ven. *ut.*
[22] So Vat. W[1].–O.; Pant[1]. *coartando*; Ven. *cohartando*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *confortando.*
[23] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *igitur*; Pant[2]. *un' altra uolta*; B.W[2]. *dunque ...ancora*; D[1].D[2]. *dunque*; M. *adunque.*
[24] Ven. *vos.* [25] Ven. *firmari.* [26] Ven. *nocuit semper.* [27] Ven. *mętas.*

(86) Intonet illa vox increpitantis Anubis[1] (87) iterum[2] in[3] Aeneam:

(88) 'Si te nulla movet tantarum gloria rerum,
(89) Nec super ipse tua moliris[4] laude laborem;
(90) Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli
(91) Respice; cui regnum[5] Italiae Romanaque tellus[6]
(92) Debentur.'

[§ 5.] (93) Iohannes namque, regius primo-(94)-genitus tuus et rex, quem, post diei (95) orientis occasum, mundi successiva pos-(96)-teritas praestolatur[7], nobis est alter As-(97)-canius, qui vestigia[8] magni genitoris (98) observans, in Turnos ubique sicut leo (99) desaeviet, et in Latinos[9] velut agnus[10] (100) mitescet. Praecaveant sacratissimi regis (101) alta consilia, ne coeleste iudicium Samuelis (102) illa verba reasperet[11]: 'Nonne quum par-(103)-vulus esses[12] in oculis tuis, caput in tribubus[13] (104) Israel factus es? Unxitque te[14] Dominus[15] (105) in regem super Israel[16]; et misit te Dominus[17] (106) in viam[18], et ait: Vade et interfice peccatores (107) Amalech?' Nam et tu in regem sacratus (108) es, ut Amalech percutias[19] et[20] Agag non (109) parcas[21]; atque ulciscaris illum qui misit (110) te, de gente[22] brutali et de festina[23] sua (111) sollemnitate (quae quidem et Amalech et (112) Agag sonare dicuntur).

[§ 6.] (113) Tu Mediolani tam vernando quam (114) hiemando moraris, et hydram pestiferam (115) per capitum amputationem reris[24] extin-(116)-guere? Quod[25] si magnalia gloriosi[26] Alcidae (117) recensuisses, te ut illum falli cognosceres[27], (118) cui pestilens animal,

[1] So T.G.; Vat. *a nubis*; Ven. *Annubis*; Pant[1]. W[1].F[1].F[2].O. *a nubibus*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *discesa da* (Pant[2]. *del*; B.W[2]. *dal*) *cielo* (see my article in *Bulletin Italien*, XII, 1–5).

[2] Ven. W[1].F[1]. omit *iterum*. [3] W[1].F[1]. omit *in*. [4] Vat. *molitis*.

[5] Vat. *regimen*.

[6] So Pant[1]. F[2].G.O.D[1].D[2].B.M.; Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1]. *regna*; Pant[2]. *i regni*.

[7] Ven. *prosteritas prestoletur*. [8] Pant[1]. *uestigiam*. [9] Ven. *latino*.

[10] Vat. *agnos*. [11] G. *reasperent*. [12] Vat. *esset*. [13] Ven. *tribus*.

[14] Ven. W[1].F[1].D[1].D[2]. omit *te*. [15] Ven. *deus*.

[16] So Vat. F[2].G.O.; Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].F[1].T. omit *super Israel* (as do Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2].); but Dante is here quoting the Vulgate (1 *Regum* xv, 17) 'unxitque te Dominus in regem super Israel.'

[17] So Pant[1]. and Vulgate; Vat. Ven. W[1].–O. *Deus*; B.M.W[2]. *il. Signore*; D[1].D[2]. *in signoria*; Pant[2]. omits.

[18] So Pant[1]. Ven. and Vulgate; Vat. W[1].–O. *via*.

[19] Vat. *percuciens*. [20] Vat. *ut*.

[21] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *parcas minime*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *non perdoni*; Pant[2]. *non perdonare*.

[22] Ven. *de gente in gentem*. [23] T. *festiva*. [24] Pant[1]. *veris*.

[25] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].–O.; Vat. *quia*.

[26] So Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. *gloriose*; W[1].F[1]. *gloriosa*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *le magnifiche cose fatte gloriosamente* (Pant[2]. *g. f.*).

[27] Ven. *cognosceris*.

capite repullulante[1] (119) multiplici, per[2] damnum crescebat, donec (120) instanter[3] magnanimus[4] vitae principium (121) impetivit[5]. Non etenim[6] ad arbores extir-(122)-pandas valet ipsa ramorum[7] incisio, quin[8] (123) iterum[9] multiplicius virulente[10] ramificent[11], (124) quousque radices incolumes fuerint, ut (125) praebeant alimentum. Quid, praeses[12] unice (126) mundi, peregisse[13] praeconicis[14], quum (127) cervicem Cremonae deflexeris contumacis? (128) Nonne tunc[15] vel[16] Brixiae vel Papiae rabies (129) inopina turgescet? Immo! Quae quum (130) etiam flagellata[17] resederit, mox alia Ver-(131)-cellis, vel Pergami, vel alibi returgebit, (132) donec huiusmodi[18] scatescentiae causa radicalis[19] (133) tollatur, et[20] radice[21] tanti erroris avulsa, (134) cum trunco rami pungitivi[22] arescant.

[§ 7.] (135) An ignoras, excellentissime[23] princi-(136)-pum[24], nec de specula[25] summae celsitudinis (137) deprehendis, ubi vulpecula foetoris istius, (138) venantium secura, recumbat[26]? Quippe (139) nec Pado praecipiti, nec Tiberi tuo (140) criminosa potatur[27], verum Sarni fluenta (141) torrentis adhuc rictus eius[28] inficiunt, et (142) Florentia[29] (forte nescis?) dira haec pernicies (143) nuncupatur. Haec est vipera versa in (144) viscera genitricis; haec[30] languida (145) pecus, quae gregem domini sui sua contagione (146) commaculat[31]; haec Myrrha scelestis[32] et (147) impia, in Cinyrae patris amplexus[33] exaes-(148)-tuans;

[1] Ven. *repupulare.*
[2] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1]. ; T.F[2].G.O. *in* ; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *per.*
[3] W[1].F[1]. omit *instanter.* [4] Ven. *magnanimis.*
[5] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. ; W[1].F[1]. *amputavit* ; T.F[2].G.O. *impedivit* ; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *taglio.*
[6] So Pant[1]. Vat. F[2].G.O. ; Ven. W[1].F[1].T. *enim.* [7] Ven. *Romanorum.*
[8] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. F[2].G.O. ; W[1].F[1]. *quia* ; T. *qui.* [9] G. *immo.*
[10] So Pant[1]. ; Ven. *via terre* (which points to *virulente*) ; Vat. T.F[2].G.O. *virulenter* ; Pant[2]. *uergeando* ; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *essendo verdi.*
[11] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].O. ; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *ramescent* ; G. *ramificant.*
[12] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O. ; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *qui prees.* [13] W[1].F[1]. *quid peregisse.*
[14] So Vat. ; Pant[1]. *preconijcis* ; Ven. *preconiis* ; T.G. *praeconjicis* ; W[1].F[1]. *praeconiaberis* ; F[2].O. *praeconizabis* ; Pant[2]. *Che anuntiarae tu auere facto* (so B.M.W[2].) ; D[1].D[2]. *che te...chiameranno.*
[15] Ven. *nonne ut tuo.* [16] Ven. *uel tu.* [17] Ven. *flagellum.*
[18] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].F[1]. ; Vat. T.F[2].G.O. *huius.*
[19] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O. ; Ven. W[1].F[1]. *rabies* ; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *la radicevole* (M.W[2]. *radicale*) *cagione di questo pizzicore.*
[20] Ven. omits *et.* [21] Pant'. *radix.* [22] Ven. *pugitiui.*
[23] Vat. *excellentiue.* [24] Ven. *principium.* [25] Ven. *speculo.*
[26] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].F[1]. ; Vat. T.F[2].G.O. *decumbat* ; Pant[2]. *serraguacta* ; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *rigiaccia.*
[27] Ven. *potant.*
[28] So Vat. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. ; Pant[1]. *ritus eius* ; W[1].F[1]. *vitia sua* ; Pant[2]. *li suoi custumi* ; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *li suoi inganni.*
[29] Ven. *Florentiam.* [30] Vat. *hec est* (so T.F[2].G.O.).
[31] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].F[1].T. ; Vat. F[2].G.O. *pecus, gregem d. s. s. c. commaculans.*
[32] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1]. ; T.F[2].G.O. *scelesta.*
[33] So Vat. (*Cinare*) W[1].–O. ; Pant[1]. *in amore patris a.* ; Ven. *in Cinere posita a.* ; Pant[2]. *nello amore del padre* ; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *nel fuoco degli abbracciamenti del padre.*

haec Amata illa impatiens, quae, (149) repulso fatali connubio, quem fata[1] nega-(150)-bant generum sibi adscire non timuit, (151) sed furialiter in bella vocavit[2], et (152) demum, male ausa luendo, laqueo se (153) suspendit. Vere matrem viperea feritate (154) dilaniare contendit[3], dum contra Ro-(155)-mam cornua rebellionis exacuit, quae ad (156) imaginem suam atque similitudinem (157) fecit illam. Vere fumos[4], evaporante[5] (158) sanie, vitiantes exhalat. et inde vicinae[6] (159) pecudes et insciae[7] contabescunt, dum, (160) falsis illiciendo[8] blanditiis et figmentis[9],(161) aggregat sibi finitimos, et infatuat[10] aggre-(162)-gatos. Vere in paternos ardet[11] ipsa con-(163)-cubitus, dum improba procacitate[12] conatur (164) summi pontificis[13], qui pater est patrum, (165) adversum[14] te violare assensum[15]. Vere Dei (166) ordinationi resistit[16], propriae voluntatis[17] (167) idolum venerando[18], dum, regem[19] aspernata (168) legitimum, non erubescit insana[20] regi (169) non suo iura non sua pro male agendi[21] (170) potestate pacisci. Sed attendat[22] ad laqueum (171) mulier furiata quo se innectit[23]. Nam (172) saepe quis in reprobum sensum traditur, (173) ut traditus faciat ea quae non conveniunt[24] (174). Quae quamvis iniusta[25] sint opera, iusta (175) tamen supplicia esse noscuntur.

[§ 8.] (176) Eia itaque, rumpe moras, proles altera[26] (177) Isai, sume tibi fiduciam de oculis Domini (178) Dei Sabaoth, coram quo agis; et Goliam (179) hunc in funda sapientiae tuae[27] atque[28] in (180) lapide[29]

[1] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. *semper*; W[1].F[1]. *sortes*.
[2] So Pant[1]. Ven. T.; Vat. F[2].G.O. *sed in bella furialiter provocavit*; W[1].F[1]. *sed f. in bellum vocavit*.
[3] Ven. omits *luendo–contendit*.
[4] Ven. *fumo*. [5] Ven. *euaporantes*. [6] Ven. *uicinię*.
[7] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. *uiscie*; W[1].F[1]. *exterae*; Pant[2]. *non sapeuoli*; D[1].D[2]. *simplici*; B.M.W[2]. *strane*.
[8] So Pant[1]. Vat.; Ven. *aliciendo*; W[1].–O. *alliciendo*. [9] Vat. *figimentis*.
[10] So Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Pant[1]. *infatuant*; Ven. *insinuat*; W[1].F[1]. *insanescit*; Pant[2]. *fa impaçire*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *fa impazzare*.
[11] Ven. omits *ardet*.
[12] So Vat. Ven. W[1].–O.; Pant[1]. *improba pro capacitate*; Pant[2]. *con maluagio uageiamento*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *con malvagia sollecitudine* (D[1].D[2]. omit *con*).
[13] Ven. *summum pontificem*. [14] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven.; W[1].–O. *adversus*.
[15] Vat. *ascensum*. [16] Ven. *restitit*. [17] Ven. *uoluntati*. [18] Ven. *uerenando*.
[19] So Vat. Ven. W[1].–O.; Pant[1]. *regem suum*.
[20] W[1].F[1].T.F[2].G. *erubescit, insana*; O. *erubescit*; *insana*.
[21] So Pant[1]. W[1].F[1].; Vat. T.F[2].G.O. *agenda*; Ven. *agende*.
[22] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.G.; Ven. *accendit*; W[1].F[1].F[2].O. *attendit*; Pant[2]. *adrende*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *attende*.
[23] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1].; T.F[2].G.O. *innectat*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *si lega*.
[24] So Pant[1]. Vat. W[1].–O.; Ven. *etiam c.*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2]. *si convengono*; B.M.W[2]. *non sic*.
[25] So Pant[1]. Ven. W[1].–O.; Vat. *iusta*; Pant[2]. *non iuste*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *ingiuste*.
[26] So Pant[1]. Vat. G.O[3].; Ven. W[1].F[1].T.F[2].O[1].O[2]. *alta*; Pant[2]. *secondo*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *alta*.
[27] Ven. *sue*. [28] Pant[1]. *at*. [29] Pant[1]. *lapidem*.

virium tuarum prosterne; quoniam (181) in eius occasu nox[1] et umbra timoris (182) castra Philistinorum operiet; fugient (183) Philistei et liberabitur Israel. Tunc (184) hereditas nostra, quam sine intermissione (185) deflemus ablatam, nobis erit in integrum (186) restituta. At[2] quemadmodum[3] sacrosanctae (187) Ierusalem memores, exules in Babylone, (188) gemiscimus; ita tunc cives, et respirantes (189) in pace, confusionis miserias[4] in gaudio (190) recolemus[5].

(191) Scriptum in Tuscia sub fonte[6] Sarni (192) xv[7] Kalendas Maias, divi Henrici (193) faustissimi[8] cursus ad Italiam anno primo.

List of passages in which the present text (T.) differs from that of the third edition of the Oxford Dante (O[3].).

		O[3].	T.
Title		Sanctissimo Triumphatori	Gloriosissimo atque felicissimo Triumphatori
		Regi, semper Augusto	Regi, et semper Augusto
		Alighierius	Alagherii
		osculantur pedes	osculum ante pedes
§ 1	l. 9	impius	impie
	l. 19	peroptatus	praeoptatus
§ 2	l. 44	in te...et	in me...quum
	l. 46	abstulit	tollit
§ 3	l. 48	Quoniam	Quando
	ll. 53–4	Romanorum potestas	Romanorum gloriosa potestas
	l. 57	contraxerit undique, tamen	contraxerit, undique tamen
	l. 71	nunquam	nequaquam
§ 4	l. 75	tamdiu	tam diu
	l. 86	vox increpitantis a nubibus	vox increpitantis Anubis
§ 5	ll. 105–6	misit te Deus in via	misit te Dominus in viam
§ 6	l. 119	in damnum	per damnum
	l. 121	impedivit	impetivit
	l. 123	virulenter	virulente
	l. 126	praeconizabis	praeconicis
	l. 132	huius	huiusmodi
§ 7	l. 138	decumbat	recumbat
	ll. 144–6	haec est languida pecus, gregem domini sui sua contagione commaculans	haec languida pecus, quae gregem d. s. s. c. commaculat
	l. 146	scelesta	scelestis

[1] So Vat.; Ven. *nos*; Pant[1]. *vox*.

[2] So Pant[1]. Vat. Ven. W[1].F[1].; T.F[2].G.O. *Ac*; Pant[2]. D[1].D[2].M.W[2]. *Et*; B. omits.

[3] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. *quidem ad modum*; W[1].F[1]. *quidem ad modum quo nunc*.

[4] Ven. *miserius*.

[5] So Pant[1]. Vat. T.F[2].G.O.; Ven. *reuelemur*; W[1].F[1]. *revolvemus*; Pant[2]. *releueremo*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *rivolgeremo*.

[6] So Pant[1]. Ven.; W[1].–O. *fontem*.

[7] Pant[1]. *xv*[a]; Ven. *xv*[o]; Vat. omits the colophon; W[1]. *xi*; F[1].T.F[2].G.O. *xiv*; Pant[2]. *a die xvi daprile*; D[1].D[2].B.M.W[2]. *a di xvi del mese d'Aprile*; the actual date, according to Pant[1]. Ven., would be April 17.

[8] So Ven.; Pant[1]. *diuj faustissimj Herricj*.

		O^3.	T.
§ 7	l. 151	in bella furialiter provocavit	furialiter in bella vocavit
	l. 160	alliciendo	illiciendo
	l. 165	adversus	adversum
	l. 168	non erubescit ; insana, regi	non erubescit insana regi
	l. 169	pro male agenda	pro male agendi
	l. 170	attendit	attendat
	l. 171	innectat	innectit
§ 8	l. 186	Ac	At
Colophon		sub fontem Sarni XIV Kal. Maias MCCCXI,	sub fonte Sarni XV Kalendas Maias,

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

THE BEGINNINGS OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE.

Over a thousand years ago there occurred an event of great importance for the future history of all Slavdom. In the year 862, the envoys of the Moravian prince Rostislav appeared in Constantinople, at the court of the Greek Emperor Michael, with the following message: 'Our people have rejected paganism, and already observe Christian law. But we have no teachers who can, in our own language, teach us the true Christian faith, so that other countries seeing this, may follow our example. Send then, O Emperor, such a bishop or teacher, you from whom all good law proceeds[1].' In these simple and impressive words legend hands down the memory of the appeal of the early Slavs to be taken to the bosom of the Eastern mother-church.

The Emperor Michael, after consulting the patriarch Photius, selected for the Moravian mission two learned priests, the brothers Constantine and Methodius. 'You are,' he said, 'citizens of Solun, and the citizens of Solun generally speak pure Slavic[2].' These brothers, who had already achieved a great work for the cause of Christianity among the heathen, devoted themselves to the new mission and set out for the Slav countries, where their memory is perpetuated as the first Slavonic teachers and as the founders of Slavonic letters.

Until their conversion to Christianity the Slavs had no real writing. 'Formerly the Slavians had no books, but they used figures and incisions for counting and foretelling, being heathen,' recorded the Monk Khrabr in his composition *On Writing*, dating from the tenth century; and this evidence is commented on in the following manner in the latest researches of Professor I. V. Jagic[3]: 'The word "counting" refers undoubtedly to simple counting, i.e., the number of things of a kind was indicated by a number of lines. The verb "to foretell" must have implied "divination," i.e., explanation by some special signs, these signs having a recognised

[1] Quoted from the work of Count Lutzow, *Bohemia* (Everyman's Library), p. 13.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] 'Questions of Runes among the Slavs,' *Encyclopaedia of Slav Philology*, Part III, p. 26.

meaning. It is not necessary to look for mysticism in "divination" of this kind, for it had nothing to do with foretelling the future, with prophecy; the verb "to foretell" only meant to express that everyone did not understand the meaning of the signs or incisions, but only those initiated into the secret of their meaning; thus those who did not know the meaning of these signs, regarded the explanation by the initiated as divination.' It would thus appear that such signs in use among the pagan Slavs were not of the character of the Runic alphabet and were not used for writing. For this reason the Christian missionaries among the Slavs, coming to them from Greek and Roman countries, were obliged to give their teaching orally, or to use Latin or Greek letters. Greek uncial and cursive writing was also used by the Slavs themselves in their ordinary everyday life in recording names of places, persons, etc. But such writing was, according to Khrabr, 'without system,' and the first and greatest service, rendered to the Slavs by the younger of the brothers, Constantine or Cyril[1], consisted in bringing the Slav script into an ordered system, by instituting a complete and exact alphabet.

In laying the foundation of Slavonic writing Cyril employed the Greek alphabet, supplying it with several new letters for the expression of those sounds of Slavonic speech, which were not to be found in the Greek language. The study of the phonetics of old Slavonic has shown that the alphabet was devised with a profound knowledge of the sound peculiarities of Slavonic speech. The transliteration of these sounds by the simplest means and with exactitude, is the work of a master. And indeed, Cyril was famous not only for his piety but also for his learning which gained him the title of 'philosopher,' that is, one who was 'doctus, litteris egregie instructus.' The alphabet devised by Cyril was called after the name of its originator, the 'Cyrillic,' and it has been preserved only among the orthodox Slavs, the Russians, Servians, and Bulgarians.

Besides the Cyrillic there existed among the Slavs another alphabet which was employed in Dalmatia and Istria with the adjoining islands and on the Croatian littoral. This is the so-called 'Glagolitic' alphabet in which part of the old Slavonic records is written. In its composition the Glagolitic alphabet differs very little from the Cyrillic. The letters of both alphabets are arranged in the same order, many of them are alike in form, and composite letters are joined in the same manner.

[1] Cyril was Constantine's clerical name.

The similarity of the two alphabets shows either that they both sprang from one source, or that one was derived from the other. The former appears more probable, i.e., that both scripts originated in a common Greek source.

The language for which the apostle Cyril arranged his alphabet was a dialect of Old Bulgarian spoken in the vicinity of Solun. That language is called Old Bulgarian, Old Slavonic or Old Church Slavonic, the word 'Old' in the latter case being important in order to distinguish the language of early Church Slavonic literature from the present-day language of the Church service. Old Slavonic has been preserved in a small number of manuscripts, for the greater part of Bulgarian origin, written approximately between the end of the tenth and the middle of the twelfth century.

Owing to the fact that the Old Bulgarian language was first employed for literary purposes, and preserves the most ancient forms of Slavonic speech, it appears as the representative of the Slavonic branch of languages in comparative philological studies. It occupies the place of the eldest sister in the large family of Slavonic languages.

After the introduction of Christianity among the Russian Slavs the Cyril-Methodius language became, with a more or less strong Russian colouring, the vehicle of Russian literature, and remained so almost until the middle of the eighteenth century. During this long period it, of course, became more and more assimilated to spoken Russian and has therefore much deviated from its original form. At the end of the eighteenth century the language of the Church was ousted from literature by the spoken language of educated Russian society.

It seems natural that for a people which had just adopted Christianity, the first need was an acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, and that the earliest documents of Russian literature should be translations of Biblical books. The greater part of these translations were made in the Southern Slavonic countries, from whence they were brought into Russia by Bulgarian and Servian missionaries and priests. A particularly important influence was exercised by Bulgaria, which in the tenth century, at the time of Tsar Simon, passed through a period which is called the 'Golden Age' of Slavonic literature. The religious movement of the 'bohomils' then agitating Bulgaria, spread not only into the neighbouring countries but penetrated to the more distant parts of Europe, as is seen in the religious history of England.

Bulgaria played, however, only an intermediary *rôle* between the literatures of Greece and Russia. She transferred to Russia in her

translations the works of Byzantine literature, and the original sources of old Russian education and literature are traceable in the Greek literature of the Byzantine period.

The character of the literary borrowings of the early Russians from Byzantium was chiefly determined by the needs of the new faith. It was, for the most part, a literature for religious instruction, as, for example, works of the Church fathers, sermons, collections of moral tales and maxims, etc. On this literature were brought up the Russian clergy and monks through whose labour and persistence 'Pagan Russia,' —to quote P. Milukov,—'was gradually transformed into "Holy Russia," into that land of innumerable churches and ceaseless bell-ringing, the country of ceremonious religious devotions, which foreigners of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries describe to us[1].'

Old Russian ecclesiastical literature offers rich and interesting materials illustrating the intellectual and religious state of the Russian people in the first centuries after their adoption of Christianity, and among the early products of this class may be found not a few writings distinguished by poetical inspiration and taste, as well as by the individual stamp of the authors. But, on the whole, these writings have not much value from the literary point of view[2].

The literary movement initiated by Christianity affected not only the devotional minds of the Russian clericals, but stimulated as well the poetical fancy of the people and introduced into Russian folk-lore an abundance of Christian ideas and motives. Old heathen traditions, customs and beliefs current among the people, were not altogether superseded by the adoption of the new faith, and the masses continued to hold a kind of double faith, in which pagan and Christian elements were mixed up. But gradually and inevitably the heathen mythology was ousted by the new religion, and the creative genius of the people turned from pagan songs to Christian traditions and legends. The popular imagination received a fresh impulse, but the new themes were treated in the old favourite forms of songs, ballads, and folk-tales.

The independent treatment of Christian traditions in the folk-poetry of Russia began comparatively late. In the earlier stages Christian literature was known to Russians as it had been shaped by the Southern

[1] P. N. Milukov, *Essays on the History of Russian Culture*, Part II, p. 19.

[2] The principal section of the early Russian ecclesiastical literature consists of 'Instructions' in which the teaching of the Russian clergy is permeated by a profound piety, and often conveyed with remarkable eloquence. Next in importance comes the literature of the 'Lives of Saints,' and the 'Annals,' gathered into one codex at the end of the twelfth century and known as the *Annals of Nestor*.

Slavs, and it underwent but few changes in Russian hands. The late rise of religious poetry in Russia was due chiefly to the slow spread of Christianity among the mass of the people. According to the historian of the Russian Church, Professor E. E. Golubinsky, the mass of the Russian people, in the period before the Mongol invasion, failed to learn anything, either of the ceremony or of the essence of the Christian religion. The new faith found eager proselytes among the ruling classes, but the bulk of old Russian society clung to the pagan cult, and its rites and customs. The traditional habits of mind and of the poetic imagination were early revealed in the religious poetry of the Russian people.

The intimate connection of the religious epic with the Russian traditional folk-lore is especially traceable in the so-called 'Ecclesiastical Verses' composed by the pilgrims[1] to holy places. The present-day descendants of the early Russian pilgrims are for the most part poor blind folk who, led by a boy, wander from village to village, and beg in a monotonous sing-song for alms. In the early times, the term 'kaliki' referred not only to poor and weak cripples living on charity, but, in general, to palmers who had undertaken pilgrimages to holy places, especially to Jerusalem. The first 'kaliki' were in Russia foreigners from the Southern Graeco-Slavonic lands. They brought with them Christian apocrypha, legends and beliefs which appealed to the imagination of the people in Russia, and supplied materials for the later religious songs and tales; these also soon became blended with the traditional folk-literature, poetry and art. Simultaneously, the national element asserted itself in the poetical treatment of these Christian materials. In one of the earliest ecclesiastical lays, *Forty Wandering Psalm-singers,* the pilgrims are endowed with some of the characteristics of the Russian epic heroes. The story says that on setting out for the Holy City of Jerusalem the pilgrims elect a 'great chieftain' who lays down for them this 'great commandment':

> Whoever steals or whoever lies,
> And does not confess to the chieftain,
> The chieftain will enquire into it.
> He is to be left alone in the open field,
> And buried to the shoulders in the cold earth.

In the same poem the pilgrims are also endowed with extraordinary strength. Arriving at Kiev and seeing from afar Prince Vladimir, they shout with such loud voices that:

[1] These pilgrims were known in Russia as 'kaliki perehozhie,' i.e., 'wandering psalm-singers.'

Cold mother-earth quaked and trembled,
Tall trees bowed their heads;
The Prince's horse knelt under him,
And his heroes fell from their horses.

The influence of the epic is traceable in the treatment of many particulars of the romance and adventure described in the above lay, and it may well be classed along with the epic sagas.

The religious songs circulating among the 'kaliki' form one of the largest sections of old Russian folk-literature. The pathos and genius of this poetry are well expressed in the lay of *Golubinaia Kniga* ('The Book of the Dove')[1], called by Professor Jagic, 'the pearl of the Russian mythological epic.' The lay is chiefly based on the apocrypha of the Bulgarian 'bohomils,' and it expounds in its first part the early Russian cosmogony in which orthodox and heretical Christian ideas are mingled with pagan beliefs.

Most of the versions[2] of the *Lay of the Deep Book* begin by pointing out the place, time, and surroundings of the miraculous 'appearing of the Book from the heavy threatening clouds.' The size of the book is extraordinary, being some hundred feet in length and breadth. Round this 'divine' book gathered 'forty tsars with tsareviches, forty princes with their sons, forty popes, forty deacons, many people, lesser folk, orthodox Christians.' But none of them can understand the book. Only to David it yields its secret, and 'all the divine writing was manifested to him.' But even the wise David, when asked by the Russian Prince to read 'the Lord's Book and declare the works of God' does not dare to do so, saying, 'I cannot read through the Book of God. That Book is not small. That Book is great. It cannot be held with hands, and it cannot be placed on the Lord's table.' To the questions of the Kiev Prince concerning the beginning of the world, and the origin and worth of different objects in it, Tsar David consents to expound in accordance with the old traditions. The Prince then puts to him a number of questions about the universe, and in his answers David traces the origin of natural phenomena to different parts of the body of Christ, deriving the sun from the face of God, the moon from His breast, the morning dawn from His eyes, etc. The literary sources of most of these explanations may be found in apocryphal writings, such as 'From what parts was Adam created' and 'The Discourse of three Saints.'

[1] The name *Golubinaia Kniga* is a later substitute for an original *Glubinaia Kniga*, 'Deep Book,' i.e., distinguished by the depth of its revelations. The former name was probably suggested to the popular mind by the image of the Holy Spirit as a dove.

[2] The version I describe is from Kireievsky's collection of Russian folk-songs.

From questions concerning the Creation David's interrogator proceeds to discuss the best things of each kind: 'Which King is King of Kings? Which town is the mother of towns? Which Church is the mother of Churches?' and the like. The answer to the first of these questions is inspired by the patriotism of the Russian reciters of the lay, the chief place among the kings being given to the 'White Tsar' of Russia as the most earnest supporter of the true Christian faith and Church. The preeminence of most things in the world is determined by their relation to the events of Christian history. Jerusalem is called the greatest of towns, it being the place of the Saviour's burial and the centre of the earth. The mother of mountains is Tabor where the transfiguration of Christ took place.

Besides the symbols of Christian cult the ecclesiastical verse celebrates the objects which impressed the thoughts and feelings of the people under the influence of native and foreign beliefs. The following question and answer suggest Iranian and other mythological parallels:

> Why is the whale mother to all fishes?
> On three fishes the earth is rested
> And when the whale moves
> All the world quakes:
> That is why the whale is the mother of fishes.

The whale found its way into the Russian poem from written tales as did also other fabulous beasts and birds, such as the unicorn who 'moves in subterranean places setting free the rivers and opening up the wells.' Some details, however, come from the old heathen mythology of the Russians. This is why in the poem David is set the task of expounding the secrets of the *Deep Book* from memory, from oral traditions, although these are apparently tinted by Christian beliefs as in the touching story of the 'weeping-herb' which is described in the poem as the greatest of herbs. 'When the Jews crucified Christ, and shed His holy blood, the Virgin Mother, Mother of God, wept bitterly for Jesus Christ. For her beloved Son the Virgin shed her tears on the cold mother-earth, and from the tears of the Virgin appeared the weeping-herb.'

The poem of the *Deep Book* also contains an episode of the struggle of 'Good and Evil' which is symbolically represented by the fight of two 'ferocious beasts,' and related as a dream of Prince Vladimir. The creative genius of the composers of the Russian poem transformed the allegory into a practical religious protest against the evils and vices of the time. Interpreting the dream of Prince Vladimir 'the wise King David' explains that the conflict of the two animals means the contest

of Good and Evil. In this contest Good is victorious over Evil, and 'Good went up to heaven while Evil spread over the whole earth, over all the Russian land, and among all the Christian peoples. Through evil the earth was made to tremble, and all the people to rebel. Through evil the people became unjust and malicious: they desired to deceive and devour one another.'

If in the religious poetry the imagination of the Russian people was busily engaged in adapting Christian traditions to the semi-heathen ideas and morals of the greater masses, it has treated the biblical events still more independently in some religious tales told in the vivid language of daily life. In these legends often only the names belong to Biblical history, and the story itself is the purest fiction. They give ample scope for the expression of national habits of mind, and wit and humour, though they bear clear indication of their religious origin in the didactic element which is introduced into them. Moral instruction was also a constituent of the early Slavonic tales of foreign origin which formed the lighter reading of the time. In fact, the moral character and Christian colouring introduced into these foreign tales by their Slavonic compilers saved them from condemnation by the Church, which strictly suppressed the poetry of the people, regarding it as a manifestation of the old paganism. The principal characters of Byzantine and Eastern stories were transformed into Christian heroes endued with Christian ideas and accomplishing Christian exploits. In the Russian version of the Greek novel *Alexandria* the hero of the story, Alexander of Macedon, was represented as a pious Christian knight worshipping the 'One God' and receiving the blessings of the prophet Jeremiah for his mighty deeds.

Owing to the ban of the Church falling on every outcome of the poetical genius of the people, the early foreign tales were not Russianised; they remained foreign. 'Our poets,' to quote Mr Polevoy, 'in borrowing subjects from foreign literatures, were content to make few changes, and only partially adapted them to Russian conditions; they altered and disfigured the proper names of the heroes, and here and there inserted, like a pearl in its setting, now a Russian proverb, now a popular riddle or a simile drawn directly from the life of the people[1].'

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, with the substitution of Byzantine influence for that of the West, these Russian tales display some new tendencies. On the one hand, the romance has gradually got rid of its moral purpose and become interesting for itself alone, and on

[1] P. Polevoy, *History of Russian Literature*, p. 109.

the other, the foreign stories are more completely assimilated to Russian conditions. The latter is especially noticeable in the case of mediaeval farcical stories—*fabliaux* and *novelle*—which were introduced into Russia from other European literatures. These tales suited the taste of the bulk of Russian readers, and, in turn, inspired original Russian tales.

An interesting example of a story which is wholly Russian in thought and expression, is *Povyest o Ershe Ershove, syne Shchetinnikove*[1], a witty satire of the sixteenth century on Russian legal procedure. In the character of Ersh the story depicts the old Russian slanderers who committed all kinds of iniquities, and counted on evading justice by their cunning. The tale opens with the law-suit brought by 'the boyar's humble son Leshch (the bream) and his friends' against 'the wicked slanderer Ersh.' 'In former years, Sirs,' pleads the plaintiff, 'the lake of Rostov belonged to us, but Ersh, that wicked man, has deprived us of this lake and of our old fat feeding-places; he has multiplied there in the rivers and lakes; he is little himself, but his bristles are like terrible spikes, and he meets us at our stopping-places and with his sharp bristles he stings our sides and pierces our ribs; he rushes about the rivers and lakes like a mad dog, who has lost his way. And we, Christian gentlemen, do not know how to live by cunning, and we do not want to quarrel and contend with mischievous people, but wish to be protected by you, just judges.' For his defence the defendant Ersh maintains his traditional ancestral rights to the lake in question and shows himself to be a highly respectable person: 'And I, gentlemen, Ersh, by God's mercy, by my father's blessings and my mother's prayers, am not a mischief-maker, nor a thief, nor a robber, nor a brigand, and I have never been brought to court, and no stolen articles were ever found with me. I am a good man, living by virtue of my own strength, and not by that of others. I am known in Moscow and in other great towns to the princes and boyars, courtiers and nobles, to the citizens of Moscow, the state clerks and their assistants, and all ranks of people, and they buy me at a dear price and boil me with pepper and saffron, and place me before them honourably, and many good people eat me after a banquet, and, having eaten, praise me.' In bringing evidence against Ersh, the plaintiff Leshch appeals to the law of God and calls several witnesses to whom Ersh objects artfully on the ground of their wealth and relations. Nevertheless the judge summons the Usher,

[1] The untranslateable title of the story ingeniously alludes to characteristics of the fish 'ersh' (*Acerina cernua*), one of its epithets being 'shchetinnik,' i.e., 'bristly.'

Okun (the perch), and commands him to take as his assistant Nalim (the eel), and bring before the court the witness Seld (the herring). But Nalim refuses to assist, saying: 'Sir, I am useless as assistant: my stomach is large, I cannot walk; my eyes are small, I do not see far; my lip is thick, I am not able to speak before worthy people.' The Usher then takes other assistants and brings Seld before the court. The herring bears witness against Ersh, as does also Osetr (the sturgeon), relating the personal injuries he has suffered from the defendant: 'As I was going from the river Volga to the lake of Rostov and to the rivers to fatten, I was met by the defendant at the mouth of Rostov lake, and he called me brother. I did not recognise his cunning, and there happened to be nobody to ask about him, the bad fellow. He asked me: "Brother Osetr, whither art thou going?" And I informed him, I am going to Rostov lake and to the rivers to fatten. Ersh then says to me: "Brother Osetr, when I passed along the river Volga I was stouter than thou and longer, my sides touching the banks of the Volga river, and my eyes being like large bowls, and my tail like a great ship's sail; but now, brother Osetr, see for thyself how thin I have become: I come from Rostov lake." Well, Sirs, hearing his seductive words I did not go to Rostov lake and the rivers to fatten. My friends and children starved with hunger, and I myself am ruined through him. Yes, and I will say yet more, Sirs: that same Ersh deceived me, Osetr, the old moujik; he brought me to a fishing-net and said to me: "Brother Osetr, let us go into the net, there are many fish there." And I began to urge him to go first, but he replied: "Brother Osetr, should the smaller brother go before the big one?" And I, Sirs, trusted his enticing word, and went into the net and stuck fast there, for the net is like a boyar's yard: the gates being wide for entering and narrow for coming out. But Ersh managed to get out of the net, and he mocked at me saying: "Hast thou indeed, brother, eaten fish enough in the net?" As they drew me out of the water, Ersh began to bid me farewell, saying: "Brother, brother Osetr, do not bear me a grudge!" And as the moujiks on the bank began to beat me with thick sticks on the head and I began to moan, he, Ersh, said to me: "Brother Osetr, suffer for Christ's sake."'

The judges found Ersh guilty and sentenced him to be beaten with a knout, and after the knout to be hanged in the sun on a hot day for his robbery and slander. But Ersh escapes punishment, saying to the judges: 'Sirs, you have not passed judgment for the sake of right, but as a result of bribery. You have acquitted Leshch and his companions,

and found me guilty.' And he spat in the eyes of the judges and jumped into the brushwood.

In its contents and style the above story belongs to the popular Russian literature and displays the beginnings of the realism which was always characteristic of Russian art and was finally established in Russian poetry and literature by Pushkin.

M. V. TROFIMOV.

LIVERPOOL.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

'Merril's Bridge.'

In his review of Dr Mutschmann's *Place-names of Nottinghamshire* Dr Sedgefield criticises the author's derivation of the first element of the name from O.E. *sēo myrige helde*, 'the pleasant slope' and suggests rather that the first element is an O.E. name *Mœrhild* or *Merehild*. Neither of these names is found in an O.E. document, but Searle presumed the existence of *Mœrhild* on the authority of the name *Merehild* or *Merehilt*, found in the *Libri Confraternitatum S. Galli, Augiensis, et Fabariensis*. The assumption that because a name is found in one Germanic dialect it must have existed in all others is at all times a doubtful one, but even supposing it true in this case, the personal name suggested would not explain the place-name. *Mœrhild* would certainly, and *Merehild* probably, have given in M.E. a dissyllabic form such as *Merild*. The only M.E. forms given by Mutschmann for Merril's Bridge are *Miriild* and *Miriel*; another form *Mirield* is found in the *Patent Rolls* (1325), and Thoroton gives (*Antiquities of Nottinghamshire*, pp. 385, 407, 444) *Murehild, Murihil, Murilde*; all, with one exception, are trisyllabic. The last three forms show further quite clearly that the O.E. stem-vowel was *y* not *œ* or *e*. Again, there is a place in Northumberland now called Moralhirst; this in the *Inq. post mortem* (1304) is called *Mirihild hyrst*. The only explanation which will cover all these names is that the first element is that suggested by Dr Mutschmann for Merril's Bridge.

Dr Sedgefield quarrels with the picturesqueness of such derivations as that suggested, and is anxious that we should, wherever possible, look for the prosaic development of all place-names from some man or woman's name. While freely admitting that there has been much folly in the past in rushing for the picturesque rather than the scientific explanation of place-names, it seems to me that just at present there is a serious danger in our place-name study of going to the opposite extreme and refusing to admit the picturesque derivation even when it is

philologically more probable than the alternative suggested. That our forefathers were susceptible to natural beauty, and to beauty just of the particular kind suggested here, viz., a pleasant bank sloping down towards a river, seems to be clearly shown by the mention in an O.E. charter (BCS 862) of a ford across the river Ebble in Wiltshire called *fæger hylde ford*, which can only mean, 'ford by the fair slope.'

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

O.E. 'NICRAS' ('BEOWULF,' 422, 575, 845, 1427).

The cognate forms of O.E. *nicras, nicor*, i.e., O.N. *nykr*, O.D. *necker*, all show a final syllable in *-r*, with the exception of O.H.G., which has the form *nihhus*. The etymology given by Skeat, Kluge, Bradley, Falk-Torp and Fick is that it corresponds to a Gothic form **niquiza* or **nikuza* from the Germanic root **nik*^{w} and the I.E. root *nig*^{w}, 'wash' or 'bathe.' From this the primary meaning of 'water-sprite' is derived. But the usual meaning of *nicor* is somewhat removed from 'water-sprite.' Sweet translates it by 'water-monster' and Holthausen by 'walrus.' Bugge and Rieger have 'walrus' and 'hippopotamus.' In the O.H.G. Glossaries *nihhus* is rendered by 'crocodile.' Bugge (*Zachers Zeitschrift*, IV, 197) quotes *Epist. Alex. ad Arist.* ed. Cockayne: 'him wæron ðа breost gelice niccres breostum' = 'hippopotami pectore,' and further, 'potius in aliis locis, equus marinus, walrus, interpretandum.'

This confusion of beasts and the substitution of one for another is, of course, natural enough with people who had never seen these strange beasts even in pictures. Such a confusion is, indeed, a common enough occurrence. In the Wright-Wülker Glossaries, for example, *anhyrne* = 'unicornis vel monoceros vel rhinoceros.' It is also used to render the biblical unicorn, which is probably identical with the rhinoceros (Brehm, *Tierleben*, III, 108). But in the same place we read that, 'ðæt deor hæfd ænne horn bufan ðam twam eagum, swa strangne and swa scearpne ðæt he fihð wið ðone myclan ylp, and hine oft gewundað on ðære wambe of deað. He hatte eac rinoceron and monoceron.' By an easy transition of meaning *anhyrne* might therefore stand for the various meanings of *nicor*. And it is not impossible that *anhyrne* in its Latin form *unicornis* does actually so stand for the Low Latin form of *unicornis*, through the stage of *illu unicorn* > *nicorn*, Modern French *licorne*. This form *nicorn* taken into Germanic with

a shifting of the stress to the first syllable and the dropping of the final *-n* would give the O.E. form *nicor* and the O.N. *nykr*, though it would not explain the O.H.G. *nihhus*.

Ernest Classen.

Manchester.

A Crux in the Text of Donne.

In John Donne's Elegy beginning 'Since she must go,' which was first printed in full as the fourteenth elegy in the edition of 1669, there is a phrase which has never been satisfactorily explained. The poet is accusing Love of having dealt harshly with him and his mistress:

> Was't not enough, that thou didst hazard us
> To paths in love so dark, and dangerous:
> And those so ambush'd round with houshold spies,
> And over all thy husbands towring eyes
> Inflam'd with th'ouglie sweat of jealousie. ll. 39–43.

In l. 42 the word 'thy' shows that he changes by an abrupt turn from Love, whom he has been addressing, to his mistress; but the curious expression 'towring eyes' has gravelled all Donne's editors. There is no help to be got from those MSS. which differ here from the text of 1669 given above; three of them, the Phillipps MS., the O'Flaherty MS. at Harvard, and the Brit. Mus. Stowe MS. 961, read 'towred' for 'towring'; the Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 4064 reads 'the towred husbands eyes'; and the Rawlinson Poetical MS. 31 in the Bodleian reads 'the Loured, husbandes eyes.' It will be seen that this last MS. alone gives any suggestion of a more plausible reading; and the Grolier Club editors have tacitly taken the hint and changed 'towring' to 'lowering,' which certainly gives the sense required by the passage at the cost of altering a single letter. Grosart less happily split the dangerous word, and conjectured 'two red' eyes; Mr E. K. Chambers (in whose edition the Elegy is No. xiii) prints 'towering' without comment of any kind; and Mr Gosse, quoting the lines in his *Life of Donne*, does not attempt to explain the phrase. In the excellent text of the Clarendon Press edition of 1912, the Elegy appears as the twelfth, and Professor Grierson, though he finds 'towring' a 'strange' epithet, regards it as 'probably correct, being a bold metaphor from hawking, and having the force practically of "threatening." The hawk towers threateningly above its prey before it "sousing kills with a grace." If "towring" is not right, "lowring" is the most probable emendation.'

It is quite clear however from a consideration of the passage that the sense required is 'peering' or something which suggests the suspicious, inquisitive side-glances of the jealous husband, who certainly would not throw his eyes up to the heavens that they might descend falcon-wise upon the guilty pair. And this notion of spying was intended by Donne, and understood by his copyists, except the unintelligent or over-intelligent scribe of the Rawlinson MS.; it is only the spelling that sets the modern reader upon false trails. The word 'twire' is found in the best poets of the period in the general sense of peeping; Shakespeare tells his friend that

> When sparkling stars twire not thow guildst the eauen,
> Sonnet XXVIII,

and Balurdo, in Marston's *Antonio and Mellida*, Part I, Act IV, says

> I sawe a thing stirre under a hedge, and I peep't, and I spyed a thing: and I peer'd, and I tweerd underneath.

So Maudlin the witch, in Ben Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, II, ii, speaks of that

> Which maids will twire at 'tween their fingers thus.

The word was also used specially of the ogling of lovers; in Fletcher's *Women Pleas'd* it occurs in the line

> I saw the wench that twired and twinkled at thee;

and it is to be found so late as Steele;

> If I was rich, I could twire and loll as well as the best of them,

says Phillis the waiting maid in *The Conscious Lovers*, I, i.

I have no doubt that the form 'towr' represented the same word, and was readily understood by Donne's contemporaries. His very phrase is reproduced in the satire *On the Dominical Nose of O.C.* (Oliver Cromwell) in Harl. MS. 4126, where the Lord Protector is said to possess

> A proud ambitious Nose! that still doth rise
> Ten hand-fulls higher than his towring Eyes.

The author of this production, Henry Tubbe, was born thirteen years before Donne's death.

The *New English Dictionary* naturally affords no help under 'tower,' and it has not yet reached 'twire.' It mentions 'tour,' however, as an obsolete form of both these words. And I think there is some significance in the use of 'tour' as Jacobean slang in the same sentence with 'twire' by Sir Walter Scott, who must have had some actual example in his

mind. When Lord Glenvarloch entered the sanctuary at Whitefriars, he was met by a couple of Duke Hildebrod's bullies, who noticed one of the Alsatian nymphs eyeing the courtier from a casement. '"Tour out,' said the one ruffian to the other; "tour the bien mort twiring at the gentry cove!"' and Scott translates in a footnote, 'Look sharp. See how the girl is coquetting with the strange gallants.' (*The Fortunes of Nigel*, Ch. XVII.)

Here the two forms are used together with slightly different shades of meaning, but they clearly represent the same word; the word which Donne spelt in yet a third way, and used with the same suggestion of jealous alertness with which it was employed by the imaginary rascal of Alsatia.

H. F. B. Brett-Smith.

Oxford.

The Polyglot Vernacular of the Canadian North West.

There are several factors which have contributed to the formation of the everyday language of the rancher and trapper, and many languages have added words and phrases to the vocabulary of the woods and plains. Many of these have already become standard English, and doubtless others will in time find their way into the dictionary and so into more common usage.

The general presence of the Indians throughout the country, and their intermingling with white men, have naturally lent to the language of the plains many words from their various dialects—generally names of objects which have no English equivalent. Thus every Indian woman is a 'squaw' and her baby a 'papoose'; the 'cayuse' or Indian pony lends his name to every horse of small dimensions; the 'chinook' is the warm winter wind blowing from the south-west; 'medicine' is commonly used in its Indian signification. 'Nitchie' is an alternate name for Indian and is also applied to the small native ponies; the 'cayote' or prairie wolf is never known by any other name; and 'moccasin' has long become standardised. 'Cheechacho,' though often used by trappers, belongs properly to the Yukon; its ordinary Western synonym is 'tenderfoot.'

From the Indians too have been borrowed many place-names, some retaining their pristine form, as Moosmin, Muskoka, Wabegan, and Manitou, whilst others have perhaps lost a little of their picturesqueness by such translations as Kicking Horse, Yellowhead, Crow's Nest, and Red Deer.

It may be mentioned here that, conversely, a few Gaelic words are to be found in the different native dialects, presumably having entered the language from constant use in trading with the Scottish factors of the Hudson's Bay Company.

The progress northward from Mexico of cattle and horse-ranching has given to this industry a great many Mexican terms. We have 'chaparejos' or 'chaps,' the fringed leather riding-trousers; 'cinch' or 'latigo' for surcingle (a word never used); 'broncho' for the wild unbroken horse; 'corral'; 'lariat'; and 'pinto,' the term applied to a piebald or blotched animal.

The long occupation of Eastern Canada by the French, and their hold of the fur and timber industries, have naturally had their effects upon the phraseology of men engaged in these pursuits.

'Mush' or 'Mush-on' (marchons) or simply 'Marse' (marchez) is the order of a driver to his dog-team. Still the half-breeds call their smoking mixture 'tabac,' and a hiding-place for furs or for eatables out of reach of wild animals is a 'cache.' Throughout the Western territory every narrow decline or cañon is a 'coulée' (pronounced without the accent) and to the lumberman a marsh is always a 'bayou.' In the country dances throughout the Western provinces many French terms have survived and been formally adopted, even to their appearance in 'call-books,' and everywhere dancers go through such figures as 'à la main left,' 'doux-ci-doux,' and 'recherchez,' without in the least understanding their real significance.

E. L. Chicanot.

Lacombe, Alberta, Canada.

Catalan Notes.

Special symbols used in the following notes are λ = Portuguese *l* in *algum*; λ = Portuguese *lh*; *j* = Dutch *j* in *jaar*, English *y* in *year*; $\tilde{n}$ = Spanish *ñ*, Portuguese *nh*; *š* = Bohemian *š*, English *sh*; *ž* = Bohemian *ž*, French *j*; θ = *th* in *thin*; δ = *th* in *then*; ϑ = *e* in *bakery*; *œ* = French *œu*, German *ö*. A grave accent means a stressed open vowel, an acute a stressed close one. In ordinary Catalan spelling, *tj* represents *tš* at the end of a word and *dž* otherwise; but there is a tendency to use medial *tš* instead of *dž*. It seems probable that this unvoicing is due to Castilian influence, as there is no *dž* in ordinary Castilian. Similarly in Valencian the influence of Castilian has caused a general formation of *tš* from an older *dž* that corresponds to northern Catalan *ž* < *dž*.

Abrotonu.

In popular Latin, *abrotanu* seems to have commonly replaced the form with stressless *o*. But since Catalan has *altre* < *alteru* and *orfe* < *orphanu*, it could have developed **avròde* from either form. The stressless *e* of Provençal is like Castilian *e*[1], even where it is derived from *o*, as in *autre* < **altro*. It is probable that the stressless *e* of written Catalan formerly had this quality, though in Barcelona it is now usually the neutral vowel *ə*. The older sound has however been kept before *a*, as in *peañə* (*peanya* < *pedānea*) beside *pəó* (*peó* < *pedōne*), *bəí* (*veí* < **veδín* < **vedzíno* < **vedžíno* < *uicīnu*).

By misdivision *l' *avròde* became *la *vròde*, and the change of gender produced *la *vròdea*, as nouns ending in *e* were generally masculine. **Vròdea* developed through **vròdia* or **bròdia* to *broida*, parallel with the early book-word *ailè* < *alienu*. In most forms of spoken Catalan, *b* and *v* are now confused, so that the *b* of *broida* is perhaps only graphic. But it is also possible that a sound-change took place, initial *v* before a consonant being unusual in early Catalan. Another development from *la **vròdia* is *la botja*, without displacement of *i*. The loss of *r* was perhaps due to the neighbouring *l*; other developments of a similar kind are *abre* for *arbre* and *atre*[2] for *altre*.

Alienu.

Catalan *ailè* and *aliè* are lacking in Meyer-Lübke's Romanic dictionary. Both forms are bookish, but the endings have been treated as in *frè* < *frēnu*. The displacement seen in *ailè* was apparently connected with the general Catalan treatment of *l*: at the end of a syllable *l* has become the *u*-like sound ʎ[3]. *Alienus* was pronounced *aʎjénus*, and for this reason did not develop the palatal sound ʎ, which at an earlier time was regularly formed from *lj*.

Cruce.

It has been customary to call French *puiz* irregular because it has a diphthong different from that of *croiz* < *cruce* and *voiz* < *uōce*. But if *croiz* and *puiz* do not rime, there is a good reason for it: the *c* of *cruce* was not the same as the *t* of *puteu*. If we leave all the vowels out of account, rimes would not be formed by *croce* and *pozzo* in Italian, nor

[1] Koschwitz, *Gram. hist. de la langue des félibres*, Greifswald, 1894, p. 9.
[2] Fabra, *Gram. de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, 1898, p. 36.
[3] Schädel, *Fonètica catalana*, Cöthen, 1908, p. 56.

by *vozes* and *poços* in Portuguese. Thus there is nothing to justify the common idea that *croiz* ought to rime with a derivative of *puteu*. Neither is there any ground for assuming, as Nyrop does[1], that *puteu* had a variant with *ū*. It is easy to say that Latin vowels were sometimes not fixed in regard to quantity or quality; but that only displaces the problem without solving it, for in this case there is no real evidence of such variation.

It is well known that Rumanian and Sardic distinguish stressed *u* < *ŭ* and *o* < *ō*, but the natural deduction has generally been ignored. The 'vulgar' Latin that levelled every *ù* and *ó* is a myth: Italian and the western Romanic tongues contain words representing the earlier time in which *ù* and *ó* were kept separate[2]. Logudorian Sardic has *kentu* < *centu* beside *puttu* < *puteu*, with *tt* < *θθ* < *tts* < *ttš* < *ttj*[3] indicating that the Romanic affricates derived from *tj* were much earlier than the similar derivatives of *k* (not *kj*). This is why *puiz* does not rime with *croiz*. In northern France the palatal sound formed from *tj* was an earlier development than the change of *ù* to *ó*, while the corresponding sound formed from *k* was a later development. Open *u* could be changed to close *u* by a palatal-contact, but close *o* was not subject to such change: thus *fŭgio* makes *fui*, but *pŭgnu* makes **póñño* > *poin* because French *ññ* was developed later than *ó* < *ù*, whereas in Catalan and Hispanic a relatively earlier development of *ññ* caused the derivatives of *fugio* and *pugnu* to assonate[4]. We may assume that in northern France something like **púidzo*, with a stressed vowel of the same quality as the derivative of *ū*, was contemporary with **króidže*; afterward this *dž* became *dz*, thus remaining distinct from the later *dž* in *charge*.

Catalan *creu* < *cruce* rimes with *veu* < *uōce*, but not with *pou* < *puteu*. The final *u* of these words arose from a normal change of *dz* through *δ* to *v*. In *veí* < *uicīnu*, *δ* was lost as in *peanya* < *pedānea*; but final *δ* made *u* in *creu* as in *nīdu* > **niδo* > **niδ* > **niv* > *niu*, *sēde* > *seu*, *uidet* > *veu*. The difference between *creu* and *pou* shows that in Catalan,

[1] Nyrop, *Gram. hist. de la langue française*, I, Copenhague, 1904, § 204.

[2] *Modern Philology*, XI, p. 347.

[3] The fricative *θ* and the intermediate affricates are found in other Sardic dialects; for details see Wagner's *Lautlehre der südsard. Mundarten* (Halle, 1907). The curious development of *tt* may be compared with the change of *θ* (< *t*) back to *t* in Swedish *tre* = English *three* = Italian *tre*.

[4] Modern Catalan has *fujo* beside *futj* < *fugit*, *vetj* < *uideo*, *veu* < *uidet*. The *o* of *fujo* was presumably due to Castilian influence, helped by conflict with the third-personal *futj*. A native analogic formation would have produced final *e*, such as is found in Valencian *cante* = *canto* (*Bulletin hispanique*, VII, p. 132) and in modern Provençal *cante* for older *cant* < *canto*.

conversely to what is found in French, the derivative of *k* produced a sound that could affect a preceding *ó*, while the derivative of *tj* did not develop this palatal sound or else lost it before the derivative of *k* formed it. The *e* of *creu* is open; Meyer-Lübke is wrong in saying that the written *eu* represents a simple vowel[1]. Catalan *è* ordinarily corresponds to Italian *é*: this remarkable development was perhaps indirectly due to the influence of Spanish. Apparently Catalan came into contact with Spanish at the time when the latter was changing *è* to a diphthong. Bilingual speakers were so numerous that *è* usually became *ie* in Catalan. Afterward the Catalan diphthong contracted to *é*, and this contraction forced historic *é* to become open.

In the Catalan derivatives of *cruce* and *uōce*, *ó* developed through *œ* and *é* to *è*. Probably *ó* became *ói*, as in Spanish **lóiñe* < **lóññe* < *longe*[2], **vergóiña* < **vergóñña* < **vergóndea*. Apparently no Catalan word now contains *ói*, except as the result of borrowing from Spanish, so we may assume that in early Catalan, as in French, the derivative of *cruce* developed *ói*. It should be noted that Spanish has *lueñe* < **lóiñe* < **lóññe* beside *tañe* < **taiñe* < **taññe*: the *ai* of **taiñe*, contemporary with the *ei* of **eira* (< **aira* < *ārea*), changed back to *a* after *ói* had become *ué*. Similarly Catalan *pau* may represent **paidže* < *pāce* corresponding to **króidže* < *cruce*. In French and Spanish, *ói* produced *ué*; in Catalan it changed through *œi* to *œ*. A parallel development, due to *ñ*, is seen in Genoese *bezœugno* (*bezœñu*), *çigœugna* (*sigœña*), *vergœugna* (*vergœña*)[3], with *œ* instead of the *u* that normally represents older close *o*, as in *cô* (*kū*) < *colōre*, *core* (*kūre*) < *currit*, *croxe* (*krūže*) < *cruce*, *voxe* (*vūže*) < *uōce*.

Duce.

Early Provençal *dotz* and Catalan *deu*, meaning 'spring,' are lacking in Meyer-Lübke's Romanic dictionary. Their development corresponds to that of *crotz* = *creu* < *cruce*.

Edwin H. Tuttle.

New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

[1] Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. des langues romanes*, I, Paris, 1890, § 121.
[2] *Modern Philology*, XII, p. 192.
[3] *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XVI, p. 118.

Two Passages in the 'Cancioneiro da Vaticana.'

Every vestige of Basque in Spain and Portugal has an interest in view of the disputed contention that Basque was once the language of the whole Iberian peninsula. In the sixteenth century Bernardo de Brito concluded from a comparison of inscriptions that 'all our ancient letters are the same as the Etruscan, used in Italy since the time of Noah.' This does not clash with the theory of Wilhelm von Humboldt (who in his *Prüfung der Untersuchungen über die Urbewohner Hispaniens*, Berlin, 1821, has a long chapter on 'Basque names in Italy') since the Basques are supposed by some ethnologists to have gone East originally from Tuscany. Jorge Ferreira de Vasconcellos, in his *Memorial das Proezas da Segunda Tavola Redonda* (1567) makes the Knight of the Crystal Arms land at 'Bayonne of Bordeaux' whence 'taking his way through Biscay he went to St Jean de Luz, three leagues from Bayonne, at a point where the Pyrenees end in the Ocean, and thence to Fonte Rabia.' He fought with three Centaurs, one of which 'began to speak Vasconço, which the knight did not understand.' This Centaur had come from Thrace with many others, now dead, taking refuge in the Basque mountains, 'and from them the Basque language remained in the country; it is not written but is still in use among the Biscayans.' In the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana* two passages may possibly be referred to Basque. The first is in *cantiga* 415:

E doi lelia doura
Leli leli par deus leli
Lelia doura.

Has this a connection with the Lelo of the Basque song:

Lelo, il Lelo (Lelo, Lelo is dead)?

Perhaps it is best to see no meaning in the words beyond the onomatopœic wailing of a dirge, what Blake in his poem *Milton* speaks of as 'the softly lilling flutes,' 'the flutes' lula lula.' It is the *ululare* of Silius Italicus (Bk iii, 345), the *αἴλινον, αἴλινον* of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, the *leila*, the *lelilí*.

The second passage occurs in *cantiga* 937:

nen an medo delhis poer bozō
e rijrsan muyten dura edarra.

It is tempting to read *muyt' end' Ura Edarra*, allowing the single town, Ura Edarra, to govern a plural verb, as in the preceding line. The

poem refers to Navarre, and Ura Edarra (in Labourd *Ederra*, cf. *berri*, *barri*) in Basque means Fair Water, Eaux-Bonnes. In his edition (1878) Dr Theophilo Braga reads *Dura e Darra*. Students await eagerly the long promised edition by Senhora Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, who will no doubt definitely set these and similar questions at rest.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

DISCUSSIONS.

Somaize and Sorel.

In the *Modern Language Review* for July, 1914[1], Mr Walther Fischer offers some suggestive comment on my studies of Somaize and Sorel[2]. He concludes that the two men compiled the *Dictionnaire des Prétieuses* in collaboration, and that they parted company because Sorel became dissatisfied with Somaize's gross exaggerations[3]. Apparently the circumstantial evidence presented in my articles concerning the non-existence of Somaize and his probable identity with Charles Sorel has seemed unconvincing to Mr Fischer, and he proposes the alternative hypothesis mentioned above. I should, indeed, be glad to assent to his view if he had adduced any proof in support of the acceptance of Somaize as an actual person of the seventeenth century. None, however, has been forthcoming, and I am compelled to hold to my original supposition, with but a slight modification. Until that supposition is rendered untenable, it is of importance to know that Sorel and Somaize may have been one and the same person, not only for the light shed on Somaize's testimony relative to the *précieuses* and what they represented; not only for the proper comprehension of Sorel's true attitude toward *préciosité*; but also, and even more, for the bearing on such works as Roederer's[4], Livet's[5], Magne's[6], and on the innumerable references to Somaize scattered through the historical, critical, and sociological treatises relating to the period of Louis XIV. The moment that one reputable witness of his own day can be produced to vouch for the existence of Somaize, my theory will become null and void. It is unthinkable that a witness of this kind cannot be found among the 700 garrulous *précieux* and *précieuses* of whom he appears to have had an intimate knowledge, or among the many literary men and Academicians with whom he was acquainted. Mr Fischer names no such person.

Another phase of the problem consists in the correct identification of Somaize—assuming that he was a fictitious character. A wide latitude would be allowable, for presumably several seventeenth-

[1] Pp. 375—378. [2] *MLN.*, Feb. 1913, Feb. and March 1914.

[3] *M. L. Rev.*, July 1914, p. 378.

[4] *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la Société polie en France*, Paris, 1835.

[5] *Précieux et Précieuses*, Paris, 1895. *Le Dictionnaire des Précieuses*, tomes I, II, Paris, 1856.

[6] *Madame de la Suze et la Société précieuse*, Paris, 1908. *Le plaisant Abbé de Boisrobert*, Paris, 1909.

century writers might have the dubious distinction fastened on them. Sorel has seemed to me to meet most satisfactorily the various tests that might be applied. Mr Fischer acknowledges the close connection between Somaize and Sorel, and confirms my impression of the latter's thorough familiarity—a familiarity evinced by nobody else, in so far as we know—with Somaize's principal effort: 'Nevertheless he (Sorel) considered the *Dictionnaire* as a valuable contribution to the study of the *précieux* movement. This is especially shown by the fact that he quotes from it extensively in a later passage of the *Connoissance des bons livres*. Out of the twenty-three *précieux* expressions mentioned, twenty-two are taken from the *Dictionnaire des Précieuses*[1].'

Mr Fischer adds to the list of fifteen works already attributed to Somaize[2] three more in which he had a hand[3]. This accords with my incidental remark on the necessity of opening a special section for Somaize's *apocrypha*, and further enlarges the estimate of Larroumet, of Schwarz, and of Somaize's 'friend.' Instead, then, of seven, eight, nine, or ten, Somaize must be credited with eighteen works. The latest of those revealed by Mr Fischer's investigation bears the date 1667. Consequently, we must revise Larroumet's statement that, 'sorti de l'obscurité en 1657, il y est rentré en 1661[4],' and Lacroix's explanation that the discontinuance of Somaize's labours was due to his absence from France to which he never returned[5]. On the other hand, this fails to affect the argument which seeks to incorporate Somaize in Sorel, for Sorel did not die until 1674, and may have resumed his *nom de guerre* from time to time. I think I am safe in saying that, in order positively to eliminate Sorel from the position given him in the articles under discussion, it will be indispensable to discover at least one piece of writing undoubtedly belonging to Somaize and composed after 1674.

Mr Fischer considers as extremely hazardous my suggestion that Somaize may (for reasons of self-advertisement, which would include the advertising of his books and calling attention to the subjects of his criticism) have written the *Songe du Resveur*—an attack on himself. As a matter of fact, it is next to impossible to determine the authorship with any degree of certainty. The book appeared anonymously. It treats Somaize without mercy. It is the only contemporary work known to us which purports to give us information about Somaize not already furnished by Somaize: '...the whole tone of this work, despite its wretched verses, is one of righteous indignation; the references to Somaize are couched in terms of deep contempt; his punishment, after his humble excuses to Molière, is most humiliating: stripped of his clothes, the author is tossed in a horse blanket. Throughout he

[1] *M. L. Rev.*, July 1914, p. 378.
[2] Cf. *The Case of Somaize*, *MLN.*, Feb. 1913, and *The Identity of Somaize*, I, *ib.* Feb. 1914.
[3] *M. L. Rev.*, July 1914, pp. 375 f.
[4] *Études de litt. et d'art*, Paris, 1893, p. 4.
[5] Cf. *Les Vérit. Prét.*, ed. Lacroix, notice, Genève, 1868, p. xii.

appears as a poor wretch, who sells Molière's *Précieuses Ridicules* to a publisher (Jean Ribou) for a paltry hundred francs, and obtains money enough to buy clothes by stealing the *Cocu Imaginaire*. The anecdote which relates that in a certain *salon* he tried to pass off Du Ryer's *Cleomedon* as his own work (*ib.*, p. 18) likewise bears the stamp of truth[1].'

To compare this with a few facts drawn from the writings of Somaize discloses a curious conflict of appreciation. In the biographical part of the *Dictionnaire* Somaize, limning a portrait of himself—a common practice among the literary men and women of that period—under the name of Suzarion, describes himself as a *galant*, an assiduous visitor in the elegant *salons* of the *précieuses*, a man so subtle in expression as to be thought satiric when he had no such intentions, a good friend, an enemy to be feared, an easy writer in both prose and verse[2]. However that may be, he evidently enjoyed the friendship of the *chancelier*[3] and of the Academician and bibliophile, Ballesdens[4], besides maintaining relations of some sort—if we are to draw the inference he wishes us to draw—with the persons of high society to whom he dedicated his chief publications. Moreover, he was the secretary to Marie Mancini, a niece of Cardinal Mazarin's, who for a while fascinated Louis XIV and finally married the *conestable* Colonna. Somaize was in her retinue when she journeyed to Rome to take her place in the powerful Italian family of which she had become a member. About two of these details, at least, we can be absolutely certain, namely, those indicating his acquaintance with the *chancelier* and Ballesdens and his probable intimacy with them; for he speaks of the favour of the former in the preface to his *Prétieuses ridicules* in verse, and as for the latter, we find in the *privilège du roi* to the *Dictionnaire* that he highly recommends the compilation—a recommendation already discussed by me[5]. Evidently the poor wretch flayed in the *Songe du Resveur* cannot have consorted with these persons.

As will have been observed, the two pictures fail to harmonise. One or the other is false: perhaps both are false. If Sorel was Somaize, however, a belief in his responsibility for the *Songe du Resveur* as well as for the other works of Somaize is not unreasonable. In the *Roman bourgeois* Furetière tells us of Sorel's familiarity with the tricks and devices of authorship and of his habitual use of them, and cites an 'invention' of Sorel's which exactly fits the case in question[6]. To have conceived the idea of turning anonymously against

[1] *M. L. Rev.*, July 1914, p. 376.
[2] *Dict. des Prét.*, ed. Livet, p. 226.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 48.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[5] *The Identity of Somaize*, II, *MLN.*, March 1914, p. 80.
[6] *Le Rom. bourgeois*, pp. 223—224: 'Mais comme il n'en trouve point (*i.e.*, publishers) qui veüille sacrifier du papier à sa réputation, il s'est advisé d'une invention merveilleuse. Il fait exprès une satire contre quelque autheur ou quelque ouvrage qui est en vogue, s'imaginant bien que la nouveauté ou la malice de sa pièce en rendront le debit assuré; mais il ne la donne point au libraire qu'il n'imprime pour le pardessus quelqu'un de ses livres serieux. Avec ces belles qualitez, cet homme s'est fait un bon nombre d'ennemis, dont il ne se soucie gueres, car il hayt tout le genre humain: et personne n'est ingrat envers luy, parce qu'on luy rend le reciproque.'

a work of his own, also published anonymously—i.e., the *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron*—would have entailed no hardship either on Sorel's fertile imagination or on his devious literary morals. The advantages of the method, for the purpose of warding off trouble, are, of course, obvious.

The motive of the writer of the *Songe du Resveur* can hardly have been pecuniary, as Mr Fischer conceives it to have been. It may legitimately be doubted if any of the works by Somaize, with the exception of the *Dictionnaire*, repaid in money the trouble taken in its composition. This would not have deterred Sorel, who was hardened to the financial failure of his books[1]. The 'premier historiographe de France' engaged in many little transactions perhaps not entirely consonant with the dignified sound of his official title, as did so many others with even more grandiloquent designations in the age of the *Grand Monarque*. That Somaize should have applied Sorel's title to himself in appearing as 'l'historiographe des Terres inconnues[2]' is, it may be said in passing, a curious detail. No less strange is his peculiar juxtaposition of a common and a rather uncommon word, found in a like combination in a critical essay carefully examined by Sorel's biographer, M. Émile Roy, and attributed by him to Sorel[3]. Furthermore, as a slight instance of the common basis of knowledge held by the author of the *Songe du Resveur* and Sorel, it may be pointed out that the tossing of a man in a blanket is manifestly a reminiscence of Sancho's plight in *Don Quijote*[4]; and Sorel, as is well known, was exceptionally familiar with the Spanish novel and imitated it rather closely in the *Berger extravagant*. The beating administered to Somaize in the *Songe du Resveur* brings to mind the beating with which, as Somaize mentions in his *Remarques sur la Théodore de Boisrobert*, the Abbé had threatened him, and recalls the almost childish glee with which Charles Sorel distributes the *coups de bâton* in *Francion*[5].

In Mr Fischer's opinion, 'Somaize's boast that the French Academy met two or three times on his account is satisfactorily explained by the twenty-third *prédiction* of the *Grand Dictionnaire* (ed. Livet, p. 190): The *Pompe Funèbre de Scarron* will cause the "forty barons" to assemble. This explanation is also accepted by Larroumet...[6].' Though it is scarcely likely that the Academy would foregather on account of this work, and no record of such meeting is discoverable, we may for the moment grant that the prediction states a fact. Yet, only one

[1] Cf. *Roman bourgeois*, p. 135, and elsewhere in the same novel, where Furetière accuses Sorel of ruining his booksellers.

[2] Cf. Roy, *Charles Sorel*, p. 307.

[3] Cf. Somaize, *Vérit. Prét.*, p. 45: 'Iscarie...Monsieur, vous pourrez poursuivre, bien que ce soit un *bourgeois*; il n'est pas façonnier, et ce n'est point un esprit de *marguillier*': and the title of Sorel's essay, 'Le Jugement du Cid composé par un *Bourgeois* de Paris, *marguillier* de sa Paroisse' (treated in Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 418 ff.).

[4] *Don Quixote*, parte primera, cap. xvii.

[5] Cf. Sorel, *Francion*, pp. 207, 215, 216, 221, 223, 228.

[6] *M. L. Rev.*, July 1914, pp. 376 f.

meeting is hereby accounted for: and Somaize's 'friend' distinctly declares two or three assemblages to have been held[1]. If we are to give weight to this assertion—and because of its unusual nature it deserves special attention and, possibly, acceptance—one or two more occasions must be sought. These I have already named as the publication of Sorel's *Rôle des présentations* (1646) and of his *Discours sur l'Académie française...pour sçavoir si elle est de quelque utilité aux particuliers et au public* (1654)[2]. Undoubtedly it was the earlier writings which earned the antagonism of the Academy, and Furetière must have intended to indicate them in particular in his observation in the *Nouvelle Allégorie* (published in 1659, that is, before the *Pompe funèbre* and the *Dictionnaire*): 'Un Capitaine *Anonyme*, qui leur avoit commandé dans sa plus tendre jeunesse, prit soin de leur conduite; & parmi elles il acquit tant de crédit qu'il s'étoit rendu formidable, même aux quarante *Barons*[3].' We now have the complete number of meetings affirmed by Somaize's 'friend' to have taken place on account of the activities of Somaize.

Some person other than Sorel may, it is quite true, have stirred the Academy to anger, and it is well at this point to mention a fact which apparently has a capital importance for the solution of our problem. Furetière, as I have remarked[4], deeply antagonised the Academy, but at a date later than the one in which we are interested. Another writer—a man of the highest social position, of keen, original intellect, of fine critical insight, endowed with a brilliant and judicious style, and, like Sorel, intensely devoted to the study of history, and having a sense of historical perspective rare at that time—Charles de Saint-Évremond, incurred the ill-will of the Academy by the publication of his comedy, *Les Académistes*, in which he poked fun at that august body. As a supplement or appendix to the first edition of Saint-Évremond's play appeared Sorel's *Rôle des présentations*[5], also a take-off on the Academy. The light and airy, inquisitive, satiric *grand seigneur* was, then, associated in certain work with the heavy, plodding, but also inquisitive and satiric Charles Sorel.

Is this merely an addition to the rather lengthy list of 'coincidences' thus far encountered in the present study? If so, the chain is not likely to be weakened by the welding of another link. In 1661, Saint-Évremond was exiled to England, where he died. In 1661, Marie Mancini proceeded to Rome. In 1661, Somaize left France for ever as her secretary. As M. Roy has proved, Charles Sorel used in several instances the ingenious device of piecing together two discrete facts in order to perpetrate a hoax having all the semblance of truth. Indeed, it may be asserted that every one of his fictions is a mixture of

[1] *Dict. des Prét., pref.*, p. 15.
[2] *The Identity of Somaize*, II, *MLN.*, March 1914, p. 81.
[3] *Nouv. Allég.*, pp. 45 f.
[4] *The Identity of Somaize*, I, p. 35.
[5] Cf. Koerting, *Gesch. des franz. Rom.*, etc., p. 117, note: 'Rôle des présentations faites aux grands jours de l'éloquence Françoise (als Anhang zur ersten Ausgabe von Saint-Évremond's *Comédie des Académistes*).'

truth and exaggeration or distortion. The method I have spoken of he followed in manufacturing his own pedigree and in fabricating Nicolas de Moulinet as the author of his own *Francion*. He seems to have employed the same trick successfully in securing a name for Somaize; so much so that M. Roy, who has unravelled the mystery of Nicolas de Moulinet, has seriously commented on the elusive Somaize in the following terms: 'On sait peu de chose sur la vie d'Antoine Baudeau, sieur de Somaize; il est probable qu'il était parent du galant marchand Baudeau, cité par Tallemant dans l'historiette de Mlle Paulet, tome III, p. 3, 16 et 17, et dans le *Grand Cyrus*, tome VII, livre I, p. 474 et suivantes[1].' What more natural than that he should have taken advantage of the departure of his putative collaborator, Saint-Évremond, to the north of Europe, and of that of Mazarin's niece to the south—an event of great public notice—for the express purpose of creating an imaginary character with a name belonging to an estimable family of that period?

The hypothesis—offered here tentatively, though with several probabilities in its favour—that Saint-Évremond, who wrote anonymously, and authorised his friend, Des Maizeaux, to print his works only after his death[2], collaborated with Sorel in the Somaize publications clears up many obscurities. It helps to explain the dedications to great personages, such as the Duc de Guise. It affords a reasonable conjecture as to the dedication to Marie Mancini, whose friend Saint-Évremond undoubtedly was, just as later he was the particular friend of Hortense Mancini, 'the most attractive of Mazarin's attractive group of nieces, [who] came to England in 1670, and set up a *salon* for love-making, gambling, and witty conversation, and here Saint-Évremond was for many years[3].' It makes plain the cause of the stylistic differences in the *Dictionnaire* pointed out by Larroumet and cited by Mr Fischer[4], and the general excellence of the *Pompe funèbre de*

[1] Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 280 f. Cf. the clever way in which Sorel caused Nicolas de Moulinet to figure as the author of his lascivious *Francion*: 'Les faits précédents expliquent les supercheries littéraires de Moulinet et celles de Sorel lui-même. Normand d'origine, Moulinet a copié dans ses rarissimes *Facétieux devis* la moitié du Recueil normand, plus rare encore que le sien, la *Nouvelle fabrique des excellents traits de vérité*; il y a ajouté des pages assez libres, pour que Sorel ait pu lui attribuer sans invraisemblance l'*Histoire comique de Francion*. Pour prouver que Moulinet a travaillé longtemps à ce roman, Sorel fait remarquer que le nom de Francion figure déjà dans les *Amours de Floris* (1613); il y figure en effet, mais c'est le nom d'un écuyer quelconque, qui occupe juste une ligne. "Moulinet, continue Sorel, écrivit donc les aventures de ce cavalier, auxquelles il donna le titre d'*Histoire comique*, et ce fut à l'envi de du Souhait, champenois, et comme pour le braver, à cause qu'auparavant du Souhait avait donné le même titre à quelques contes qu'il avait ramassés." Le libraire Toussainct du Braye a en effet publié, en 1612, un recueil de petites histoires fort lestes, composé par du Souhait, mais ce fut précisément pour faire concurrence à ce Recueil, que le libraire Jean Millot, l'éditeur ordinaire du sieur Moulinet, lui demanda d'écrire un livret analogue, les *Facétieux devis*.

De tous ces faits, il résulte que Moulinet n'a jamais écrit d'*Histoire comique*. Sorel a compté sur la précision de ses renseignements et sur la rareté de quelques livres, introuvables dès le XVIIe siècle, pour donner le change aux bibliographes, et il y a assez bien réussi.' (Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 431 f.)

[2] *Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed., 1911, article on Saint-Évremond.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *M. L. Rev.*, July 1914, p. 378, note 2.

M. Scarron, as remarked by Larroumet[1]. It gives us the key to Somaize's verses about the dictionary of the Academy,

> Ah ! je vois bien que c'est l'ouvrage
> De Penelopes, et je gage
> Que dans ce livre l'omega
> Jamais place ne trouvera[2],

as an extension of the well-known line in Saint-Évremond's *Les Académistes*:

> Mais ils passent deux ans à réformer six mots !

though the idea was, perhaps, rather a common one. It renders more natural the portrait of Suzarion which, applied to Saint-Évremond, cannot be considered fulsome. It reveals how Somaize managed to obtain material on such an extensive range of *précieuses*, and in especial, on some of the secrets of a few of the more exclusive society-women. It makes easier of comprehension the steady output of works about the *précieuses* during a number of years, and the unflagging interest with which that more or less humorous undertaking was pursued, for Saint-Évremond was as curious an observer of *préciosité* as Sorel[3]. In short, the acquisition of Saint-Évremond as a party to the literary exploitation of the *précieuses* does away with many doubts concerning the identification of Somaize, and in his flight to England in 1661 we have the first satisfactory clue as to the cessation of most of the Somaize work in 1661.

I believe that this view of the collaboration in the Somaize papers will appear reasonable to those who have hesitated to accept Sorel as the sole author. It is surely safer to argue in favour of historical persons about whose existence there is no uncertainty than to admit as a *de facto* character a man whom nobody ever saw or mentioned as a reality. Sorel's familiarity with Somaize and his fondness for him demonstrate that he knew a great deal about the truth of the matter: and his participation in the publication of *Les Académistes* shows that he and Saint-Évremond were at one in their attitude towards the

[1] Larroumet, *Études*, etc., p. 18: 'Néanmoins, elle (the *Pompe funèbre*) est très supérieure aux autres ouvrages de Somaize; malgré bien des bizarreries et des fautes de goût, la raillerie y est moins lourde et moins pénible, l'esprit moins rare, le style surtout moins obscur et moins embarrassé; enfin, la critique des auteurs contemporains n'y manque parfois ni de justesse ni de finesse. Au total, cette supériorité est assez marquée pour que l'on se demande si ces quelques pages sont vraiment de Somaize, s'il n'a été qu'un prête-nom ou s'il a eu un collaborateur. Mais à quoi bon lui en contester le mérite? Admettons qu'en un jour de bonheur unique il s'est surpassé lui-meme....' (It should be remembered that both Sorel and Saint-Évremond were unusually acute literary critics—the latter, almost always, and in an agreeable style: the former, in most cases in which his personal animosity did not enter, and in rather dry, unrhetorical language.)

[2] *Procez des Prét.*, ed. Livet, p. 109.

[3] Cf. quotation in the *Grand Larousse*, tome XIV, from L. D. Gilbert's study on Saint-Évremond: 'Toutefois, dans l'un et dans l'autre (i.e., La Rochefoucauld and Saint-Évremond), il ne serait pas difficile de retrouver les façons raffinées de l'hôtel de Rambouillet, dans Saint-Évremond surtout, bien que personne, avant Molière, ne se soit diverti plus agréablement aux dépens des précieuses.'

Academy, while other facts indicate a common interest in the *précieuses* and a common method of interpreting the actions of that social and quasi-literary circle. Both were averse to open attack in this field, for what seem to be thoroughly intelligible reasons, and carried out their skirmishing by means of innuendo, indirection, and anonymousness.

Mr Fischer, regarding Somaize as having actually lived, deduces from a passage in Sorel's *Connoissance des bons livres* (1672)[1] that the *Dictionnaire des Prétieuses* was written jointly by Sorel and Somaize. Where he is inclined to accept Sorel's words at their face-value, I am inclined to see a considerable amount of sarcasm and sly satisfaction and, perhaps, a belated attempt to appease the wrath of some *précieuses*, about whose age and moral habits the writers of the *Dictionnaire* were imprudently loquacious[2]. This quotation—the 'crucial passage,' as Mr Fischer observes—taken from a book printed long after the *Dictionnaire*, lacks, to my mind, the force of Sorel's *Loterie*, published in 1658 and containing an exact description of what began to issue from the press about two years later as *Le Grand Dictionnaire des Prétieuses ou la Clef de la langue des ruelles* and *Le Grand Dictionnaire des Prétieuses, Historique, Poetique, Geographique, Cronologique et Armoirique*. It is hardly necessary for me to insist on this, however, since Mr Fischer has expressed his readiness to accept Sorel as 'one of the most zealous and scientific contributors' to the *Dictionnaire*.

J. Warshaw.

Columbia, Mo., U.S.A.

English and French Metric.

M. Verrier still persists in misunderstanding my attitude. I hold that (1) the phonetic constitution of the speech-material, as determined by the 'logos' and 'ethos' intended in any particular case, and the metrical-scheme are alike inviolable; (2) the ear tolerates a certain degree of divergence between them, the 'adjustment' being sufficient when this degree is not exceeded; (3) in 'alternating' verse the ictus is exteriorized, when it is exteriorized at all, by 'weight,' which may include as possible factors, stress, length, pitch or even (as Prof. Grammont has shown) consonantal implosion, etc.; (4) the ictus is not invariably

[1] *M. L. Rev.*, ut supra, p. 378.

[2] Cf. portion of passage cited by Mr Fischer: 'Il y eut aussi le *Dictionnaire Historique, Poetique et Geographique des Precieuses*, Livre d'une invention tres-galante, mais tres-mal executée parce que ceux qui ont composé cet Ouvrage, ayans travaillé sur de faux Memoires, ont donné plus ou moins d'âge aux Dames qu'elles n'avoient. Ils leur ont attribué des qualitez qui ne leur convenaient pas, et ont raconté leurs avantures au plus loin de ce qui en est arrivé. Outre cecy, l'insolence estoit horrible d'aller faire imprimer des Clefs qui expliquoient tous les noms empruntez, pour plusieurs personnes connues. Nous n'alleguons ce Livre que parce qu'il est remply de plusieurs façons de parler tout extraordinaires.' (Note the use of the plural authorship, though the book appeared as the work of only one man and was always so described by Somaize's 'friend.')

exteriorized at all, the beat being in this case purely mental; (5) the *chief* constituent of 'weight' in English is stress, in French length.

Thus the line:

Le grand feuillage vert autour de moi chantait,

as analysed by M. Verrier fits into a quantitative scheme:

⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ –

and, if we admit that 'length' is the chief factor of 'weight' in French, and that every ictus need not be exteriorized, this portion of speech-material fits the metrical scheme:

⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ –

i.e. the 'adjustment' is sufficient. Further, even M. Verrier will admit that the syllables *-illa-*, *-tour* bear secondary accents however slight, so that the second syllables of the second and fourth 'feet' are not only at least as long as, but also slightly more stressed than the first syllables of the same feet. The ictus is thus exteriorized slightly, even in these feet.

The line:

Le soleil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs

offers greater difficulty. M. Verrier's quantitative analysis is (the division into feet is my own):

1 1 | 2 1 | 1 2 | 1 1 | 2 1 | 1 2.

Even if M. Verrier will not admit the strengthening of the syllables *so-* and *-cla-* (as I should be inclined to do), the first and fourth feet are at least pyrrhics, i.e., the adjustment is sufficient, the ictus being merely not exteriorized. In the second and fifth feet, the mere fact of an *e* mute syllable being lengthened to the value of an ordinary unstressed syllable, e.g., to the value of *-cou-*, gives it a mental, if not an actual weight that causes it, at the very least, to balance the preceding syllable, so that these feet are, at any rate, pyrrhics (or spondees) also, if not even, psychologically, iambs. I may illustrate my meaning by referring to the emphatic pronunciation of a word like 'belle' in French, in such a phrase as: *Elle est belle, mais je dis belle*, where the *e* mute syllable of the second 'belle' is lengthened and appears not only to balance, but even to outweigh the first syllable, although the first syllable retains the stress.

What else I have to say in reply to M. Verrier may conveniently be summarized:

(1) I do *not* profess that the word 'merrily,' e.g., 'may be either three or two (syllables), in adjustment to a fixed and definite metrical scheme.' I assert, on the contrary, that, in a careful and artistic English pronunciation, the word is sometimes, as a matter of fact, of two syllables and sometimes of three, and that the poet uses the word sometimes as two syllables and sometimes as three according to the meaning

he wishes to convey—the 'ethos' as distinguished from the mere 'logos' of the line.

(2) That 'a line is divided in everybody's pronunciation into falling rhythmic groups' does not necessarily imply that the metrical scheme to which it is adjusted is also falling. To take this for granted is to confuse the *phonetic* with the *metric* division of the line. So long as M. Verrier will not acknowledge that these are distinct conceptions, it is futile to argue with him.

(3) I cannot dispute an artistically competent Frenchman's *pronunciation* of French. I can dispute his *scansion* of a French line of verse[1]. M. Verrier seems to suggest by italicising the syllables I consider to be ictus syllables in the line *Le soleil*, etc., already quoted, that I *accent* these syllables in my pronunciation of the line. I do nothing of the kind.

(4) If the phonetic division is to be taken as the metric division, then, as M. Verrier himself says, 'la prose rythmée présente les mêmes caractères que la poésie' (*L'Isochronisme dans le Vers Français*, p. 33), and the distinction between verse and prose disappears. Will M. Verrier explain wherein, rime and caesura apart, verse differs *metrically* from rhythmical prose? The failure to make such a distinction possible is an inherent weakness of M. Verrier's system of French scansion. It does not follow and cannot follow that because, e.g. in the alexandrine, 'le rythme normal comporte quatre temps marqués par vers' (*ibid.*, p. 47), the *metre* of the Alexandrine is quaternary, any more than it would follow (and here M. Verrier will agree) from the fact that very many English heroic lines have only three accents that the metre of the English heroic line is ternary.

(5) I did not take Prof. Legouis' words to mean that he accepts my view of French scansion. But I used his examples, which I accepted at their face value, not of course to prove that the alexandrine has normally more than four 'stresses,' but to show that a six-ictus 'scansion' is not inherently absurd or in contradiction with the 'phonetic' facts. The six-ictus hat turned out to fit the phonetic head at least as adequately as the four-ictus hat—to keep up M. Verrier's metaphor.

In conclusion, I am glad to be able to agree with M. Verrier that 'there are in English poetry two great classes of metres: beat-verse and syllabic verse.' But I cannot agree that 'in both, of course, the rhythm is accentual, i.e., rests on the isochronous recurrence of a beat.' I have no hesitation in declaring my belief that there are in English two different rhythms: one 'accentual,' the other 'alternating'—one, in the main, indigenous to the Germanic languages, the other imported from France. Nor can I accept the further statement of the nature of the difference between 'beat-verse' and 'syllabic verse': 'In syllabic verse,... no syllable may be suppressed or doubled without a compensating addition or omission in another bar.'. I held this view in 1905 and, under the influence of Mr Bridges, adumbrated it in my doctorate

[1] I have Prof. Hardie with me (*What is Metre and how should it be taught?* pp. 12 sqq.).

thesis, with which M. Verrier is acquainted, but I have since rallied to the alternating view of syllabic verse[1] and do not believe that syllables are ever doubled or suppressed in this type of verse. That contamination is frequent is undoubtedly true. I shall look forward with interest to M. Verrier's paper on this subject. I have gathered considerable material for a study of the same problem in French verse.

T. B. Rudmose-Brown.

Dublin.

[1] Strange as it may seem, my conversion dates from my discussion of 'inverted feet' with Mr T. S. Omond in the *Academy* (1908). Formerly I should have considered that, e.g., in the lines:

'Slippers lined choicely for the cold'...
or 'Catching each flower by the stalk'...

there was suppression of a syllable in the first foot with compensation in the second. Now I am convinced that the second syllable of each line is 'heavy' enough to at least balance the first, and that the alternation is inviolate. The same applies to:

'Suddenly flashed on her a wild desire'....

On the contrary I should consider such a line as:

'And únloved lips kissed in the night-time,'

as five-beat accentual verse, stressed as indicated, or, if dipodic, as six-beat, with a silent third beat.

REVIEWS.

Place-Names of South West Yorkshire. By ARMITAGE GOODALL. Cambridge: University Press. 1913. Revised edition, 1914. 8vo. vi + 314 pp.

The place-names of Yorkshire are receiving their full meed of attention. So recently as 1910 Dr F. W. Moorman gave us a valuable study of the Place-names of the West Riding and now we have another work of wider scope and fuller detail dealing with 'so much of the West Riding as lies south of the Aire from Keighley onwards.' Dr Moorman's book suffered from certain limitations, largely self-imposed, the chief being (1) the confining of his researches to such names as were to be found in certain medieval surveys of Yorkshire, (2) the failure to discuss the Keltic element beyond the narrowest possible limits. In the present work Mr Goodall attempts to deal with a much larger proportion of names, in fact with all those that interest him on the modern map, whether they occur in medieval documents or not. Such an attempt has hitherto been seldom made, the chief exception being Sephton's *Handbook of Lancashire Place-Names.* The result of this larger scope is that many interesting names of Anglian, Scandinavian and Keltic origin are now for the first time explained, but side by side with this advantage there is the serious drawback that when many names are explained without the help of any medieval forms, an uneasy feeling is aroused as to whether such etymologies are of much value. At any rate they are of very different value from the rest, and every time that the author points out the extraordinary difference which exists in other names between the medieval forms and the modern ones he gives fresh point to our fears. If such modern forms are to be discussed in books on place-names, and some of them fully deserve treatment, they should be kept as a distinct part of the book, so that their comparative lack of authority may be very clear to the large amateur public who will make use of a book of this kind.

High praise must be given to Mr Goodall for the industry and skill with which he has gathered together a vast mass of material and arranged it for the most part with clearness and conciseness. The only fault here is that at times he rather overwhelms us by quoting a large number of modern names which by some similarity of form may possibly throw light on a difficult etymology. Such names may however be mere will-o'-the-wisps, unless we are given at the same time the steady light of their medieval forms to keep us straight. Mr Goodall has made some really excellent finds and his etymologies are to a large extent to

be trusted. The chief weakness is perhaps the treatment of the very important question of the personal names which are to be found in place-names. The present tendency in place-name study is undoubtedly to explain more and more names as containing personal names for their first element. That may or may not be right, but it must not be carried to the extent of seizing in uncritical fashion personal names wherever they may be found in explanation of some difficult place-name. Searle's *Onomasticon* is an invaluable work for students of O.E. personal names but it must be remembered that he included many names for which we have no O.E. authority. Thus *Ongær* (104), *Loppo* (206), *Papo* (231), *Winco* (301) are quoted from Searle, but he gives them only as found in Förstemann's *Altdeutsches Namenbuch* and Piper's edition of the *Libri confraternitatum S. Galli*. Such names may have had O.E. parallels, but it should be made quite clear that their existence there is not established. The name *Croda* is of doubtful occurrence in O.E. and *Crodo* (111) comes from Förstemann. So also *Aelman*, *Aellman* and *Aelmanus* (58) are merely variant forms of *Aelfman*. In the Introduction (p. 13) the assertion is made that many names are formed with the terminations *-er* and *-et*, e.g., *Azer* from *Azo*, *Oter* from *Ota*, *Baret* from *Bar*, *Lufet* from *Lufa*. The examples do not support the theory; *Azer* is for O.N. *Azur* (<**Atsur*) and has nothing to do with *Azo*, whatever the origin of the latter may be, *Oter* is for O.N. *Óttarr* (<**Áht-hario*) and has no connection with *Ota*, *Baret* is O.N. *Barðr* and is unrelated to *Bar*, *Lufet* is for O.E. *Lufgeat*. So also *Berner* is from O.E. *Beornhere* and *Blacker* from O.E. *Blachere*. Names were not formed with these suffixes in Old English, and there is no justification for such hypothetical names as *Coller* (109), *Hubber* (178), *Huder* (179) formed with such a suffix. Some of the Norse names quoted are very doubtful. The authority for the Scandinavian name *Buthar* is not given: it is not to be found in Lind's *Norsk-Islandska Dopnamn* and in any case could not give Mod. Eng. *Butter*; Lind does not give a Norse name *Uha*— Naumann is to be used with caution—and even if there were such a name it could not give rise to English *Ughill*. Some of the Frisian names quoted from Brons' *Friesische Namen* are interesting but it should have been made quite clear that they are only parallels.

Some of the etymologies are at fault in their phonology. Thus O.N. *bœna* cannot develop to M.E. *Banner* (66); the M.E. forms of *Blacker*, *Blackley*, *Blake Low* (76) cannot go back to O.N. *bleikr*; O.N. *ból* 'a farm' would give Mod.-Eng. 'bool' and not 'bole' (77); *Chisley* (102) cannot be connected with O.N. *kjesa*; M.E. forms in *Himling* (165) cannot be connected with O.E. **Hamel*; the persistence of *ay* spellings in the earlier forms of *Snapethorpe* (262) shows that it must be connected with some Scandinavian word with *ei* and not with *a* as its stem vowel. *Shackelton* (252) cannot go back to O.N. *skökul*, it must rather be connected with O.E. *sceacol*. A good many place-names in *-ster* are recorded (67, 77, 181 and 270) and are traced to O.N. *staðr*. They should rather be connected with the plural

form *-staðir*: the inflexional *r* in the singular would not be maintained. So also *Slithero* (earlier *Slitherow, Slidrihen*) can hardly contain O.N. *sliðr* 'a scabbard.' A few further scattered points may be noted. *Angram* (159)—the element *Anger* is not confined to the North, it is found in *Angersleigh* (Som.) and in *Ongar* (Essex D.B. *Angre*): *Apperley* may be for earlier *Apeltreley* as in the case of *Apperley* (Nthb.); *Butterby* (88) is not of Danish origin but a piece of folk or antiquarian etymology for earlier *Beautrove* (O.F. *bel trové* 'well situated'). *Chipping Ongar* in Essex is certainly not an example of a place-name followed by a personal name. *Chipping* is O.E. *cīeping*, 'bargaining' hence 'market,' and is frequently prefixed to the names of market-towns, e.g. Chipping Norton, Chipping Barnet, often to distinguish them from other towns or villages of the same name, e.g. from High or East Barnet, from High Ongar. For the name *Ongar v. supra*. The Northumberland *Kielder* (earlier *Keldre*) should be taken into account in dealing with the difficult name *Calder* (earlier *Kelder*) (91); there is no doubt that many of the English place-names in *Dud-* (124) go back to one or other of the common O.E. name-forms *Dud, Duda, Dudda*; similarly those in *Lud-* (204) are generally to be referred to O.E. *Lud* or *Hlud*; *Marley* (208) should probably be traced to O.E. *merdleah, merd* meaning 'dung'; *Ovenden* (223) is to be connected with the O.E. personal name *Ofa* rather than O.E. *ufan* = above, for the O.E. adverb was never thus used as a prefix; the name *Skew* (251) is sometimes of adjectival origin meaning 'crosswise'; cf. the frequent use of *Skew* in names of bridges which do not cross a road or railway at right-angles.

The introduction gives some account of each of the ethnic elements represented in the district. The discussion of the Scandinavian element is specially thorough. It is to be regretted that use was not made of Lindkvist's *M.E. Place-names of Scandinavian Origin* in this connexion. In an appendix Mr Goodall advances one more theory as to the site of 'Brunanburh.' Its chief supports are an identification of the *Vinheiði* of *Egilssaga* with *Went* (earlier *Wenet*), a river name found also in Wentbridge and Wentworth, and of *Brinsworth* (D.B. *Brinesford*) with *Brunsford* and *Brunford*, the names given to the site of the battle by William of Malmesbury and Ingulph of Croyland—neither of them very good authority in this matter. The identification of *Wenet* with *Vinheiði* from a phonological point of view is just possible, though very doubtful; that of *Brinsworth* and *Brunsford* is impossible. The suggestion is made that D.B. *Brinesford* is derived from an earlier **Brunesford*, presumably by i-umlaut of the stem vowel, but umlaut had of course ceased to operate long before this.

In conclusion we may congratulate the author on the completion of what was very evidently a labour of love. His very zeal has at times led him astray and exposed his work to unfavourable criticism in certain of its details.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Anglo-Saxon Christian Poetry. By A. J. Barnouw. Translated by Louise Dudley. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1914. 8vo. 41 pp.

The title-page states that this attractive booklet substantially reproduces an address delivered at the opening of the Lectures on English at Leiden in 1907. Dr Barnouw has taken the opportunity to expand some paragraphs and to add text-references; but the character of the essay remains frankly popular. Naturally, then, it offers nothing new; but it is the popular work of one whose scholarship is both exact and imaginative. We endorse the comment of Dr Carleton Brown, who arranged for the English translation: 'a lucid and vigorous statement, unencumbered by technical detail, of the distinctive and important contribution made to the beginnings of English Literature by the Anglo-Saxon Christian poets.' Our sole criticism is against occasional over-emphatic statement—the obvious danger in a short popular address. For example, the contrast between the 'communal character' of the earliest O. E. poetry and the personal character of Cynewulf's is excellently drawn; but it should not be suggested that the personal creative factor was utterly lacking in the former. Nor should the element of personal temperament be forgotten, and everything attributed to general tendencies, in the discussion of the later poetry; the 'sentimental' Satan of *Christ and Satan* is probably to be explained, not merely by the lapse of time since the introduction of Christianity into England, but by the gentler character of the individual poet. Were it not so, this conception of Satan would be general in the later O. E. poetry, which it is not. Again, to say that 'the only woman's figure of importance which Christian epic has preserved for us is that of Judith' is to dismiss Elene in too cavalier a fashion. In every case, the direction of Dr Barnouw's emphasis is correct; but here and there he might have avoided danger of misconception by more guarded statement. His general outline remains admirably clear and just. Dr Dudley's translation leaves nothing to be desired. The essay is excellently suited for use by general readers and by pass degree students; while more advanced students will probably find that it gives new clearness and order to their knowledge.

A. R. Skemp.

Bristol.

Englische Lautlehre nach James Elphinston. By Engelbert Müller. (*Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft 43.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1914. 8vo. xii + 272 pp.

This book is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of English pronunciation in the latter half of the eighteenth century. The treatment is adequate, and does not show the prolixity of some works of this character—e.g., Ekwall's Introduction to his reprint of Jones's *Practical Phonography*, where we have 305 pages of Ekwall to 153 of

Jones. Elphinston was a Scot, born in 1721, and he died in 1809. Up to the age of thirty-one he lived in Scotland, and this fact must be borne in mind in using his description of English pronunciation. He had a school in London from 1753 till 1778, returned to Scotland for a year, and finally settled in England for good in 1779. He was regarded by his contemporaries as an accomplished and highly estimable man—'a Quixote in whatever he judged right.' He was a friend of Dr Johnson, who said, 'his inner part is good, but his outward part is mighty awkward.' He moved throughout his life in respectable society. Son of an Anglican clergyman, educated at the High School in Edinburgh and at the University of that city, he travelled in his youth in France and Holland and acquired such a knowledge of French that 'he not only conversed, but wrote both in prose and verse with the facility and elegance of the most accomplished natives.' His first wife was a Miss Gordon, niece of General Gordon, and his second, whom he married in old age, was a niece of Bishop Falconer. These details, given by Müller, are important in regard to a writer on pronunciation, since we must insist on knowing his credentials as an authority on the speech of his age. Elphinston was a very copious writer—Müller enumerates no less than eighteen works from his pen—and of them six are books dealing directly with English Grammar and pronunciation, of which the most important is *The Principles of English Language, or English Grammar*, 1765. Müller prints in extenso an English paraphrase of Martial's Epigram beginning—'Edictum domini deique nostri.' This work (1783), which deals, among other things, with the 'corruption of language,' is of interest, because certain peculiarities of Cockney speech are mentioned, and specially indicated by italics and distinguishing spelling in the text. If the history of London provincialism is ever written, this will form an important document for its period, and while space fails here to go into this interesting question in detail, we may note in passing that the interchange of [w] and [v] is clearly shown—e.g., 'wulgar,' 'vith,' 'vonc't' (once), etc. It may be well to utter a caution against accepting too absolutely Elphinston's statements that this or that peculiarity was a vulgarism in his day. We may, on the whole, believe him when he says that such and such pronunciations occurred, but because he condemns them, it does not follow that they were not in fact correct in the best 'Received Standard' of his day. It is a common experience, that an educated Scotchman comes to England, and retains his native speech basis and general habits of pronunciation unimpaired, in spite of many decades of life in England. Such a person is very apt to consider that most, or at least very many pronunciations, which are unfamiliar, or unhabitual to himself, are vulgarisms, whereas they are often nothing of the sort. The Scotchman's views on these methods are further influenced by his own dislike of much that is characteristic of the best English speech. In illustration of this we may mention the loss of [r] where the Scot pronounces it, and the use of the voiced [w] in words spelt with *wh*. Therefore, since there is no reason for supposing that Elphinston was less free from prejudice regarding English pronunciation

than many of his countrymen are to-day, I should never accept anything as a vulgarism for this period, on his bare statement, nor unless the fact were confirmed from other sources. Thus, for instance, it is extremely doubtfulwhether the pronunciation suggested by his spellings, 'larn'd,' 'toonic,' 'gownd,' in his version of Martial, were really vulgarisms in the middle of the eighteenth century, though they would certainly now be considered as such. The study of eighteenth century writers on pronunciation possesses two main interests—one, that it enables us to trace the rise of specific vulgarisms, and the other that it shows the fluctuation in custom in Received Standard. As regards the first point, for instance, besides the now obsolete London vulgarism of transposing of [v] and [w] already alluded to, we learn from Elphinston that the initial aspirate was often dropped, and also added where it did not belong, among the lower sort of people, as early as 1787. We may, however, be sceptical when he tells us that these practices obtained among 'manny Ladies and Gentlemen' (Müller, p. 219).

As for the fluctuation of usage in Received Standard English, it is to be noted that apart from a few rather difficult questions such as the vowel sound in 'walk,' etc., very little actual *sound change* has taken place in polite English since the middle of the eighteenth century, and that the numerous differences observable between the speech of say 1760 and that of the present day are, for the most part, merely due to the substitution of one type for another. It would be a grave error to suppose that eighteenth century [hēt] 'heat' has become [hīt]. The former has simply disappeared, except in a few regional dialects, and the present-day form has taken its place, having been in existence among certain sections of the community a long time before [hēt] fell into desuetude.

It is this process of the casting out of one type and superseding it by another drawn from a different Regional, or, more often, from another Class Dialect, which constitutes, in the main, the history of Standard English for the last hundred and fifty years. The social factors which are chiefly responsible for these phenomena can be surmised, but they have still to be clearly brought to light, and their specific results tabulated and run definitely to earth.

H. Cecil Wyld.

Liverpool.

The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser. Edited with Critical Notes by J. C. Smith and E. de Sélincourt (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors). London: H. Frowde (Oxford University Press). 1912. 8vo. lxx + 736 pp.

This is a most valuable book, containing in small compass all that is important in the larger Oxford edition, as well as something more. The text is the same, with some correction of mistakes; the critical Appendix gives us the substance of the critical notes and the critical appendices of the larger edition; and there is added a

useful glossary, by Mr H. Alexander, and an important Biographical and Critical Introduction by Professor de Sélincourt. We find here also the Spenser-Harvey correspondence, as published in 1580, beginning with 'Three proper and wittie familiar Letters: lately passed betwene two Vniuersitie men: touching the Earthquake in Aprill last, and our English refourmed Versifying,' and ending with 'Two other very commendable Letters of the same mens writing: both touching the foresaid Artificiall Versifying, and certain other Particulars.' It is very convenient to have this correspondence at hand for reference.

In the biographical part of the Introduction there is sometimes a certain vagueness about details, as is instanced by the reference, p. xiv, to the expression 'the Southern Shepherd's boy' without investigation of the meaning of the phrase, or even apparently with the assumption that the 'Southern Shepherd' was Sidney, a quite untenable hypothesis. However, the biography is a useful one, and the literary appreciation proves to be very valuable. A sane view is taken of Spenser's relation to his Italian models, and Professor de Sélincourt's defence of the plan of the third and fourth books of the *Faery Queene*, as a combined treatment of the virtues of Chastity and Friendship, is interesting. He remarks that 'the intricate plot, attacked by critics as a series of irrelevant episodes, is fully justified by the deeper purpose of the poet.' With reference to the *Faery Queene* generally, the writer deals in a competent manner with the various kinds of allegory, the characterisation, the diction, the versification, and other points of style. There is a very useful note on pp. lii and liii about the principal historical identifications. Of the other poems he treats in a slighter manner, but the *Epithalamion* is acknowledged as Spenser's 'highest poetic achievement, and *Muiopotmos* as 'among the most charming of Elizabethan fantasies,' while sufficient justice is done to the satiric qualities of *Mother Hubberds Tale*.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. Edited by Arnold Glover and A. R. Waller (Cambridge English Classics). 10 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1905–1912. 8vo. lxii + 456, viii + 527, 464, 412, 398, 418, 395, 387, 388, 389 pp.

The completion of this edition of Beaumont and Fletcher is a matter for congratulation both to the Cambridge Press and to the public. It is true that the promised volume of notes, with glossary and other supplementary material, has not been published, and that owing to the pressure of other work, Mr Waller has been obliged to give up the idea of undertaking this himself; but we are led to believe by the preface of the tenth volume that the design has not been abandoned, though it must be left to other hands. The edition was originally undertaken by Arnold Glover. At the time of his death,

in January 1905, the first and second volumes were in an advanced state of preparation, but neither had been published; and Mr Waller was requested by the Syndics of the Press to complete the work, a task in which he had the valuable assistance of Mrs Glover, so far as regards the materials collected by her husband. The plan was to give a careful reprint of the folio of 1679, the first complete collection of the plays attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher, with collation of all the previous editions, whether in quarto or in folio. Better texts no doubt may in some cases be found in the quarto editions of particular plays, but it was more in accordance with the plan of the 'Cambridge English Classics' to adopt a single edition as a basis for the whole, than to treat the plays independently; and if a single edition was to be followed, it must be that of 1679. The folio of 1647 avowedly contains only those plays that had never been printed before; that is, it excluded all that had appeared in quarto, and these were in most cases the best and most popular. *The Maid's Tragedy, A King and No King, Philaster, The Faithful Shepherdess, The Knight of the Burning Pestle, The Scornful Lady, Rule a Wife and Have a Wife, The Elder Brother, The Two Noble Kinsmen,* for example, and some seven or eight others, were excluded from it by this rule. One incidental result is that the folio of 1647 contains hardly anything by Beaumont, perhaps only his share in *The Coxcomb,* and his portion of *Four Plays in One,* apart from the *Masque of Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple,* which ought not to have been in the volume at all, having been previously printed. The present edition, it may be noted, includes the prefatory matter and commendatory verses of the folio of 1647, the former of course omitted, and the latter only partially reprinted, in that of 1679.

The design of this edition is 'to provide (i) a text in which there shall be no deviation from that adopted as its basis, in the matter of spelling, punctuation, the use of capitals and italics, save as recorded, and to give (ii) an apparatus of variant readings as an Appendix, comprising the texts of all the early issues, that is to say, of all editions prior to and including the Second Folio.' It is not intended as a critical edition, but it supplies the materials for criticism in full measure, and for the use of scholars nothing better can be desired. Obviously the collations involved in this plan are of very various extent and involve very various degrees of labour. In the case of no less than thirty-five plays (including the *Four Plays in One*) no collation is needed except with the first folio. On the other hand, of the most popular plays, *The Maid's Tragedy, A King and No King, Philaster* and *The Scornful Lady,* no fewer than seven quarto editions had been published in each case, and of *Philaster* as many as eight; and all these four plays occur in the first volume, so that Glover's work was far more extensive in proportion to the whole than at first sight it may appear. The only other that approaches these plays in number of editions previous to 1679 is *The Faithful Shepherdess,* of which there had been five quartos: no other play had had more than three.

Considering that the variants of all the other early editions are

given, it is not necessary to insist on the comparative want of original authority in the text of 1679. That of the 1647 edition was printed from manuscript copies, probably such as had been in use at the theatres, as is proved in some cases by the interesting stage directions which frequently occur, anticipating the needs of the action, *e.g.* 'Boy ready for the songs,' 'Bowle of wine ready,' 'Bawd ready above,' 'Job. Bacon ready to shoot off a pistol'; but it must be noted that in the case of most of the plays which appear in the two folios the text of 1679 is decidedly the more correct of the two, though in some minor matters, such as the use of 'ye' for the modern 'you,' the earlier folio probably came nearer to the original text. It should be noted that the address of the Booksellers to the Reader in the same folio makes special mention of a copy of the plays 'which an ingenious and worthy Gentleman had taken the pains (or rather the pleasure) to read over; wherein he had all along Corrected several faults (some very gross) which had crept in by the frequent imprinting of them. His Corrections were the more to be valued, because he had an intimacy with both our Authors, and had been a Spectator of most of them when they were Acted in their life-time.' This copy, probably from the context one of the first folio (in spite of the inaccurate remark about 'frequent imprinting'), they had purchased at a high price, and from the same hand they had received some Prologues, Epilogues and Songs, which were not in the former edition. It is then probably to this 'ingenious and worthy Gentleman' that we owe most of the emendations in the plays which had appeared in the first folio, and it is clear that he was regarded as one who had had access to good sources of information. If we owe him also the songs in *The Spanish Curate*, for example, our debt to him is considerable.

Besides the ordinary differences of reading, the present edition records also with considerable fullness the variations in the matter of verse and prose form, sometimes reprinting in the Appendix considerable portions of an early text, with a view to elucidating these. Thus the fifth act of *A King and No King*, which is given in verse by the first four quartos and in prose by the two others and by the second folio, is for this reason given in full from the first quarto. Again in the case of *The Elder Brother*, which is printed as prose in the folio, we have the whole play in the Appendix in its verse form, from the quarto of 1637. A collation is also given of the Egerton MS. text of the same play, as also of the early manuscript of *The Humorous Lieutenant*. The Masque is printed in full from the quartos as well as from the folio.

The reprint in this edition generally of the folio of 1679 seems to be very accurate. With regard to the collations we are warned not to expect a quite exhaustive record of variations: punctuation has been silently normalised, and misprints in the quartos and first folio are recorded only when they are of some interest. There are also a few accidental omissions. Taking a few of the plays which appear in the two folios, we find the following variants of the first folio not recorded: Vol. iii *The Mad Lover*, p. 14, l. 3, 'faces,' (evidently the true reading);

33, 35, 'Coward goe with' (omitting the comma); 47, 25, 'my limbes' (necessary for the metre); 57, 38, 'from royall blood'; 74, 4, 'here': *The Loyal Subject*, 91, 32, 'I had thought,' 92, 15 and 28, 'ye,' 'yee' (so also 103, 31; 115, 16; 132, 21, etc., though sometimes this variant is recorded, *e.g.* 115, 3; 116, 1); 111, 37, 'minds,' 112, 7, 'times': *The Laws of Candy*, 238, 34, 'home-borne'; 251, 25, 'Her beauty.' But these are small matters, and in other plays which have been tested in the same manner, as *The Custom of the Country* and *Valentinian*, no omissions of any consequence have been found.

On the whole it may be said that this edition is by far the most useful for critical purposes that has yet been published.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Poetical Works of George Meredith. Edited by G. M. Trevelyan. London: Constable. 1912. 8vo. xv + 623 pp.

Meredith spoke of himself towards the end of his career as 'an unpopular novelist and an unaccepted poet.' If the verdict of the 'general reader' were taken to-day, the description would still appear just. The high qualities of his work must always be obscured for the many, as they are illuminated for the few, by the idiosyncrasy of his style. Yet as a prose-writer Meredith has now a great name, uncontested. No one who sincerely loves human nature, admires genius and seeks reality, can, if he possess a brain, resist the appeal of the novels. The poetry appeals to a widening circle of readers, but the circle will always be narrow. Those who relish the philosophy of the novels will read it, and so must all serious students of our literature. But it will never conquer the poetry-reading public. Its substance is too tough and its form too individual. Those, therefore, who have looked eagerly for the one-volume complete edition of Meredith's poetical works are serious students, and it is from their standpoint that Mr Trevelyan's edition must be judged.

Preface and Notes bear the excellent editorial qualities of modesty, brevity and sincere enthusiasm. But these qualities alone will not suffice. The student requires in a modern edition of a poet at least three things: (1) that the lines of the poems be numbered; (2) that the date, place and occasion of first publication be accurately stated; (3) that in all cases of textual alteration, the original versions be given, or if space prohibit this, that the fact be always noted and reference made to the editions through which the text evolved.

In all three points the present edition is found wanting. The lines are not numbered: the date of first publication is given but not always accurately: the occasion is seldom stated. Some few textual readings are supplied, but many interesting original versions are ignored altogether, and there is no systematic reference to earlier editions. Two test cases will be sufficient for illustration.

A poem of special interest to students of Meredith, 'In the Woods,' appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, August, 1870, in nine stanzas. Meredith never reprinted it as a whole, but he detached three stanzas from it and published them, slightly revised, under the titles 'Whimper of Sympathy' in *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, 1887, and 'Dirge in Woods' and 'Woodland Peace' in *A Reading of Earth*, 1888. Mr Trevelyan dates the poem wrongly, 1873, prints it as Meredith never published it, in the mutilated form in which it is left when the three stanzas in question are amputated, and places it on his own initiative under Meredith's heading *A Reading of Earth*. 'Whimper of Sympathy,' 'Dirge in Woods' and 'Woodland Peace' appear in their right places, but in no case is any note made of the original form of the poem, its place of publication, or its subsequent textual history.

'Modern Love,' the greatest poem Meredith wrote, was published first in 1862 in the little volume entitled *Modern Love and Poems of the English Roadside, with Poems and Ballads*, with the motto

> This is not meat
> For little people or for fools.

from the *Book of the Sages*. He did not republish it till 1892, when it appeared with the Prefatory Sonnet, 'The Promise in Disturbance,' along with 'The Sage Enamoured and the Honest Lady.' Mr Trevelyan gives none of this information save the bare date of first publication. No reference is made to the significant little motto. 'The Promise in Disturbance' appears without a note. Only one emendation is given, XLVII 15:

> And still I see 1862

altered to

> where I have seen 1892

(Mr Trevelyan omits the dates), out of the large number which should at any rate have been referred to. Many are interesting metrically, and some few psychologically. There is, for instance, ironic value—the higher for its subtlety—in the change in XXV 16:

> My dear, these things are life:
> And life, they say, is worthy of the Muse. 1862.

altered to

> And life, *some think*, is worthy of the Muse. 1892.

Meredith published successive volumes of poetry, each embodying new material, in 1851, 1862, 1883, 1887, 1888, 1892, 1898. A collected edition, revised by him, appeared in 1898, a fresh volume of poems in 1901, and these, along with scattered poems retrieved from periodicals dating from 1849 to 1908, were the materials to be arranged in the posthumous *Complete Poetical Works*. The problem of order and arrangement is in such a case the most difficult that confronts the editor. The strictly chronological order has obvious advantages, but it has the fundamental disadvantage of cutting across the author's own grouping. The arrangement under subject-headings, when such a plan

is initiated by the poet himself, has again much in its favour. Its disadvantage is that to make it complete the editor must himself insinuate stray poems under headings which their author never intended to embrace them. The Memorial Edition of 1910 aims at combining the two methods. Thus it follows faithfully the grouping of Meredith's later volumes, *A Reading of Earth*, etc., but places first in order a collection of Early Poems, most of which were deliberately relegated in Meredith's collected edition of 1898 to the back of the last volume, and printed in smaller type. Mr Trevelyan, whilst following in the main the Memorial Edition, deviates from it to infringe still further Meredith's own arrangement. He attempts a stricter chronological order, and at the same time extends the subject-heading classification by detaching a new group under a heading of his own, 'Poems on National Affairs.' Both these deviations are of doubtful good. The insistence on strict chronological order places first in the volume a weak poem, 'Chillianwallah,' which has no other distinction than that of being the earliest known publication of Meredith. He showed what he thought of it himself by never reprinting it. On the other hand, the silent abduction of such a poem as 'Aneurin's Harp' from Meredith's own group of *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life* to its place under Mr Trevelyan's heading, 'Poems on National Affairs,' provokes a righteous resentment. The Notes to the present edition are, as the Preface indicates, purely explanatory. Whilst they are lacking in bibliographical and textual matter, they give an overmeasure of simple explanation. Most readers could dispense with the information that 'Cytherea = Aphrodite (Venus) Greek goddess of love and beauty,' and surely no one who reads the poem 'Night of Frost in May' needs to be told that 'In the second stanza and following stanzas the song of the nightingales is described.' But we should like to know the circumstances, for instance, behind the publication of the 'Lines to a Friend visiting America.' Published in the *Fortnightly Review*, Dec. 1867, they were addressed to John Morley, during whose absence in America Meredith took charge of the Review. Mr Trevelyan gives none of this information.

But if the defects of this edition are obvious, its qualities are obvious too. Mr Trevelyan has done good service both here and in his own book, *The Poetry and Philosophy of George Meredith*, by opening up for those unfamiliar with Meredith the main lines of his thought. In the Notes to the present edition he has given, in addition to much simple paraphrase which may aid the unconverted reader, several useful references and explanations which will be valued even by the tried Meredithian. See, for instance, his notes to 'The Empty Purse,' and to 'Alsace-Lorraine.'

Our quarrel with his editorial work is that it does not square with the demands of English scholars. But if this or any other edition can win its way to a wider public, lovers of Meredith will augur well for the coming generation. For his poetry is a well-spring of thought, humour and imagination that quickens both brain and spirit. Embracing as it does all the important spheres of human activity, social and political as

well as individual, it has the special virtue of close touch with the actual. And its Reading of Life as well as its Reading of Earth interprets the present in wise relation with the past and in ardent preparation for the future.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

OXFORD.

Untergegangene und veraltete Worte des Französischen im heutigen Englisch. Von HUGO BRÜLL. Halle: Niemeyer. 1913.

Monsieur Hugo Brüll a eu une excellente idée, celle de signaler les mots français qui, vieillis ou disparus de notre langue, ont survécu en anglais. Malheureusement l'exécution du travail est de qualité tout à fait inférieure. L'auteur ne sait qu'insuffisamment le français et l'anglais, ce qui lui fait commettre de nombreux oublis. L'examen du commencement de la lettre *a* permet de noter l'omission des mots anglais suivants: *abele* de l'anc. franc. *abel*, forme dialectale de *albel*, du latin *albellus*, désignant le peuplier blanc; *acceptance, acceptor, accidental, accordant* (qui aurait dû être cité à côté de *accordance*); *accountant* (qui aurait dû être cité à côté de *account*); *accrue, acetous, acquire, acquittance, affined* (du v. fr. *affin*, anglicisé), *afflict, affray* (qui avait autant de titre à entrer dans cette liste que *abash* puisqu'il vient de *esfrayer, affrayer*, comme *abash* vient de *esbaïr*); *ague, alas*, etc. Il est inutile d'aller plus loin dans l'examen méthodique d'un ouvrage aussi superficiel. Aussi me suis-je borné à noter les mots dont l'absence m'a frappé au cours d'une lecture rapide. *Mattress* de *materas, mountaineer* de *montanier, sirloin* anglicisation de *surlonge* manquent également à l'appel. Pourquoi? Pourquoi mentionner *bachelor* et exclure *esquire*? Pourquoi mentionner *expend* de *espendre* et ne pas mentionner *to spend*? Et pourquoi mettre *engaol* et omettre *gaol*? Pourquoi trouvons-nous *strange* de *estrange* et non pas *strait* de *estreit*? L'absence de ce dernier est d'autant plus *strange* que l'auteur, page 115, cite *estresse* de **strictia* lequel dérive de *strictum* qui a justement donné *estreit*. Pourquoi ne pas citer les vieux mots français *bucler, butiller* restés en anglais sous les formes *buckler, butler*? Pourquoi citer *budget* et *jury* et ne pas citer *tunnel*, anc. fr. *tonel*, repris par le français sous sa forme anglaise tunnel, tout comme budget et jury, de l'anc. fr. *bolgete* et *jurée*? Pourquoi citer *to juggle* de *jogler* et oublier *jewel*, v. fr. *joel*? Pourquoi omettre *stubble* qui n'est autre que le v. fr. *estouble*?

L'auteur aurait pu nous donner une introduction où il nous aurait indiqué de façon précise ce qu'il entendait par ancien français; s'il y comprenait les dialectes et quels dialectes; sur quelles raisons il se fondait pour dire qu'un mot était *veraltet*; le degré de confiance qu'on peut accorder au dictionnaire de Sachs et Villate. Il n'aurait pas eu

grand peine à enrichir sa bibliographie et il aurait pu se dispenser d'écrire de façon grotesque le nom du célèbre auteur de *The English Dialect Dictionary.*

Louis Brandin.

London.

D. Francisco Manuel de Mello. Esboço biographico. Por Edgar Prestage. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade. 1914. 8vo. xxxv + 614 pp.

The late Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo was of opinion that Mello was 'the greatest genius of the Peninsula in the seventeenth century, with the exception of Quevedo,' and expressed surprise that he should have found no biographer. He was a man whose life could never have been uninteresting, even had it been spent in the most humdrum circumstances and whose actual adventures would have made the dullest man an object of interest. Yet he has had to wait three centuries for a biography, and owes it finally to a foreigner, although it is written in Portuguese. However, he has waited to some purpose, and the present biography is likely to stand foursquare to the winds of criticism and will not be superseded, although it is to be hoped that fresh documents will be discovered before a second edition is printed. Mr Prestage in an accompanying leaflet asks that any knowledge of documents or facts concerning Mello's life or works should be communicated to him at the Academy of Sciences, Lisbon. Meanwhile this volume contains not only a detailed bibliography but the text of 121 documents, many of them now first printed. The accepted date of Mello's birth has long been 1611, and, in spite of the fact that his age is given as 18 in 1626, and that in one of his letters he says that he became a soldier at 17 (in 1625), the date 1611 would still be going from critic to critic had not Mr Prestage discovered the certificate of Mello's baptism (December 1, 1608), which is here given in facsimile. It may be said that baptism is not birth, but two passages in Mello's work tend to prove that he was born on St Clement's day, November 23. The case is precisely similar to that of Cervantes. A passage in document No. 1 (p. 427) confirms the date 1608: Mello says that he attained the age of 36 in the royal service (at the time of his imprisonment in 1644).

Mr Prestage remarks that in the familiar style Mello is unexcelled, and says that his imprisonments and exile 'made of this versatile soldier a great writer.' At his best he stands out from contemporary writers as a rapier among uncouth and tawdry sticks, and there can be no doubt that his misfortunes gave the edge to his directness, a quality so rare in Portuguese authors. Probably, too, he had studied with care the more familiar works of the classical Portuguese writers of the sixteenth century, the *Ropica Pnefma* of João de Barros or the *Ulyssipo* of Jorge Ferreira de Vasconcellos, for instance, in which one is reminded of Mello's style but may look in vain for his wit and wisdom. He will always be read with pleasure and interest not only or chiefly in

his *Guerra de Cataluña* but in his admirable letters and dialogues. And those who read him will certainly go on to read his life as told in these pages by Mr Edgar Prestage, if they have not already done so as an introduction to his works. In view of the importance of this book not only for Portugal but for Spanish history and literature a new edition is likely to be soon called for, and in this a few minor misprints will be corrected, and we may hope, an index added. On p. 153, for instance, *Vittoria* should read *Vitoria*; p. 59, *Zorrilla* is misprinted *Zorilla*; p. 61, *dilettanti* has become *dilletanti*; p. 175, *encarregaram-se* should perhaps be *encarregarem-se*. *Folle* (p. 408) appears instead of *fol est*, and *England* (p. 23) is clearly a slip for *Europe*. The Lisbon Academy of Sciences is to be heartily congratulated on the production by one of its members of a work of such authority and at the same time so attractive.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

La Théologie dans le Drame Réligieux en Allemagne au Moyen Age. Par GEORGES DURIEZ. Paris et Lille: J. Tallendier. 1914. 8vo. 645 pp.

Les Apocryphes dans le Drame Réligieux en Allemagne au Moyen Age. Par GEORGES DURIEZ. Paris et Lille: J. Tallendier. 1914. 8vo. 111 pp.

Like a complete cycle of 'Miracles,' Dr Duriez' longer thesis takes us from the unfathomable mysteries of the Trinity 'dénombrer les habitants du ciel et ceux des enfers, raconter la création de l'homme... passer en revue les Patriarches et les Prophètes, suivre Jésus dans sa vie cachée et dans sa vie publique, décrire sa Passion, sa mort, sa résurrection et son Ascension...pour conduire les lecteurs, après les horreurs du jugement dernier, à la béatitude éternelle du ciel.' In the chapter on 'L'Antéchrist' he states the method from which he never departs: 'je signale d'abord dans la Sainte Écriture et les Pères les passages où il est fait allusion à l'Antéchrist.'

Dr Duriez tells us nothing new about the evolution of the religious drama or its relation to national life and popular practice: his domain is one of ideas. It is here that he corrects our perspective and widens our view by showing us the immense range of learning commanded by many mediaeval dramatists. Their additions to the evangelical accounts and every variation from tradition are accounted for. He makes us realise the widespread influence of theologians like St Vincent de Beauvais and Jacobus de Voragine, whose adaptations of the Fathers were followed. Whole passages from the *Summa Theologiae* of St Thomas Aquinas were translated and 'dramatised,' whilst the fascination of the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus was intense.

The erudition of Dr Duriez is most evident in discussing a play like *Uerdingen* (1682), which is really a dispute about the Holy Eucharist

between Catholica and Haeretica (Église Protestante). The latter, aided by 'Malus Spiritus,' invokes the aid of certain authorities who seem to doubt 'la présence réelle dans l'Eucharistie,' and Dr Duriez, feeling that he must come to the rescue of the dramatist whose most convincing argument against transubstantiation is 'comment, tu voudrais te joindre à ces papistes qui mangent leur Dieu!' undertakes to disprove these interpretations by showing how St Thomas Aquinas and other exegetical writers explained them.

As a result of this theological erudition and thoroughness in detail the results obtained often supplement and correct the researches of others in the same field, and it is brought home to the reader how easy it is to assume indebtedness on the part of a dramatist to a predecessor, where both used the same sources and imbibed the same culture. This is patent in the famous 'scène des étendards' from the apocryphal gospel which was incorporated in many passion-plays, like that of Alsfeld. Thus Wirth, finding the same incident similarly treated by *Urstende*, concluded that this was the model for the Alsfeld play; whilst Wilmotte traces it back to the French mystery-play of Arras, 'dont le début est identique ainsi que le plupart des développements.' Dr Duriez prints in parallel columns the scene from the Alsfeld drama and the apocryphal text as edited by Tischendorf of which it is clearly an almost verbal adaptation. Assertions like Froning's that the *only* sources of the *Benediktbeurer Passionsspiel* were the dialogue between Pilate and Joseph of Arimathaea and five verses about the blind Longinus will in future require proving. Similarly many of the metaphors, like the comparison of the Immaculate Conception with the sunbeam passing through a crystal, are shown to be drawn from the Fathers and the mystics and were the common tradition of the age.

There is, however, a tendency in this method to overlook a purely literary evolution of the drama. Where Froning found the nucleus of the Alsfeld play in the *Marienklagen* of Vienna and Trèves, Dr Duriez rightly points out that many lines can be traced to earlier Latin 'lamentations de la Vierge,' which existed independently in dramatic form; but he completely ignores the development of longer cycles from the shorter Epiphany plays, as exemplified by the St Gall and the Benediktbeurer 'Weihnachtsspiele,' based on the short Freising *Stella*, which is still purely liturgical.

However, very little in this domain escapes the sweep of his net: he even on occasion adds to the materials garnered by so eminent an authority as Dr Creizenach. Yet his attention is so exclusively focussed on pre-Lutheran writers that he does scant justice to the new Protestant spirit which infused the breath of life into German drama. He shows the spread of the doctrine of 'good works' as enunciated by one drama:

> gleichwie wasser feuer leschi,
> Also almuesen die sünd hinwescht;

but he might at least have been expected to note a play like Burkhard Waldis' *Parabell vam Vorlorn Szohn*, which has running through it, like a

golden thread, the Lutheran teaching 'aus Gnaden sollst du selig werden.' Quite rightly, however, the *Spiel von den Zehn Jungfern* is not considered as a drama in the interests of the Reformation, the foolish virgins falling through the absence of 'good works.' By restricting his investigations in some parts to the longer 'mystères' of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, he avoids the violently Protestant plays of the Swiss, although he does not only deal with those produced 'en Allemagne' as his title suggests.

The title of the second dissertation is somewhat misleading. Thus the Apocrypha of the Old Testament which furnished so many dramatic themes such as Susannah, Tobias and Judith is completely excluded from its scope. Three of the four chapters treat of the Gospel of Nicodemus, whilst the last is devoted to the origin of the one play *de Transitu Beatae Mariae Virginis* (*Himmelfart Mariä*). Wülcker's suggestions with regard to the sources of some incidents in the passion plays have been worked out in Dr Duriez' convincing analysis, particularly of scenes like the deliverance of Joseph of Arimathaea and the splendid vision of the 'descensus Christi ad inferos.' A short statement as to the nature and scope of this gospel would have simplified the matter for the non-theologian. Thus the *Gesta Pilati* are cited and quoted from without our being told that the first sixteen chapters go by that name; whilst the relation of the popular historical works of Jacobus de Voragine and St Vincent de Beauvais to the apocrypha is not indicated, for it was to these writers that the wide spread of this gospel was due, an influence which is reflected in the Grail romances. Wülcker's study still remains as a necessary introduction to this thesis.

In Dr Duriez we miss a sympathetic attitude towards the more pagan elements of the mediaeval stage, like the 'diableries' and the comic 'mercator' ('unguentarius') of the Easter plays, which, according to Mr E. K. Chambers, whose work on the mediaeval stage is nowhere cited, 'did so much to enliven the later German plays,' and were 'a thoroughly characteristic product of the mediaeval folk-spirit,' giving the mysteries their hold on the populace to an extent that critics are often loath to admit. Nevertheless Dr Duriez has, by his industry and his learning, attained his aim and said the last word on 'die theologische Bildung der deutschen Dramatiker des Mittelalters.'

L. A. Triebel.

London.

The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century. By Gilbert Waterhouse. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. 8vo. xx + 190.

The comparison of the present volume with Professor Herford's *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*, which the author himself suggests in his Introduction, is hardly justified, but it is, none the less, a valuable contribution to our

knowledge of the seventeenth century in Germany. Mr Waterhouse has given us a book of much honest and painstaking research, and has presented his results in a clear and readable form. We cannot help thinking, however, that he would have done better to adhere to what he states to have been his original intention, and investigate thoroughly one *genre* or author, instead of seeking to obtain a bird's-eye view of the whole century.

The seventeenth century in Germany has always been a much neglected period, and indeed, except for one work of genius, Grimmelshausen's *Simplicissimus*, and a few lyrics, cannot be said to have produced anything of high importance. But in so far as it was a century of preparation, in which, in the absence of a national literature, foreign influence was predominant, it offers to the literary historian an attractive field for 'comparative' investigations. There are several valuable and exhaustive monographs on individual authors and even whole periods, but the general surveys of Lemcke, Bobertag, Palm and Borinsky are far from being final.

The present book contains a survey of all forms of literature in their relations to English literature, except the drama, 'the material for which having increased to such an extent, will easily fill another volume.' The appearance of this sequel will be awaited with interest, for the problem of the 'Englische Comödianten' in Germany is an attractive one. As Mr Waterhouse points out, the main distinction between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as far as Anglo-German literary relations are concerned, is that, whereas in the sixteenth we have a predominance of German influence over English, in the seventeenth it is the reverse.

The 'Early Travellers' to England and Germany in the first half of the century do not appear to have taken much interest in the literary achievements of either country, and, except for Georg Rudolf Weckherlin, brought little back with them of intellectual significance. Weckherlin himself, however, is a remarkable personality and deserving of further investigation. The fact that he lived for thirty years in England, was married to an Englishwoman, and was Milton's predecessor as Secretary of Foreign Tongues, renders him a personage of particular interest to us. In this respect, the researches of H. Fischer in the archives of the State Paper Office[1] have brought to light many new and interesting facts. Weckherlin, in his aloofness from the school of Opitz, showed an independence of judgment that speaks well for his own appreciation of literature. It is thus not surprising, that his *Oden und Gesänge* should show an occasional borrowing from Spenser, Sir Henry Wotton and Sir Thomas More, as well as from other less famous English authors. Another Elizabethan, Sir Philip Sidney, proved an innovator of the first rank, as far as German literature was concerned. Through his *Arcadia*, which was first translated into German by a certain Valentinus

[1] G. R. Weckherlin's *Gedichte*, Dritter und Supplement-Band, Stuttgarter Literarischer Verein, CCXLV, 1907.

Theocritus of Frankfort in 1629, and revised by Opitz in 1638, was introduced into Germany that pastoral literature, the influence of which made itself felt down to the time of young Goethe. Until now it has been assumed that Valentinus Theocritus was but a pseudonym of Opitz. Mr Waterhouse, by a minute comparison of the poems of the two editions, proves conclusively that the translator and the reviser were different persons.

The Latin novels of English authors, Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter et idem*, John Barclay's *Argenis*, were even more popular abroad than in England. Barclay himself was, by upbringing, very much of a foreigner, and it is possibly due to this fact that his *Argenis* was one of the most widely read books of the century. In Germany it was again the 'father of German poetry,' Opitz, who first introduced this novel to wider circles of his compatriots by his German translation of 1626. The influence of Barclay's romance on German literature is seen in Christian Weise's drama, *Von der sicilianischen Argenis* (1684).

The Epigram was the most characteristic and also the most successful literary *genre* of the seventeenth century. Apart from the classical models, it was again an English source which proved most fruitful in Germany, the *Epigrammatum... Libri Tres* of John Owen (1606), of which no less than four so-called translations appeared in Germany from 1641 to 1653, whilst borrowings from him by the German epigrammatists of the time are numerous.

In the chapter 'History in Literature' the author principally discusses those dramas which deal with English or German history. The indebtedness of the Elizabethan drama to German historical sources has already been treated at some length by C. H. Herford in his *Literary Relations*. It is relatively unimportant. The Thirty Years' War, however, and the fortunes of the English princess Elizabeth, the unfortunate Pfalzgräfin and Queen of Bohemia, aroused much interest and enthusiasm in England. Thousands of volunteers, especially Scottish, fought in the armies of Gustavus Adolphus, and the tragic figure of Wallenstein inspired at least one famous drama, Henry Glapthorne's *Tragedy of Albertus Wallenstein*, 1639, a play which was subsequently carried to Germany by the 'Englische Comödianten,' and performed at Stettin in 1690. The first event in English history to attract attention in Germany was the divorce and death of Catherine of Aragon treated by Johann Christoph Hallmann with but little regard for historical truth, and with still less for artistic effect. Then there are some half-dozen dramas on Mary Stuart. The assumption of Mary's innocence and her representation as the victim of calumny and malice are characteristic of most of these plays, and it is interesting to note this German popular attitude towards the heroine long before Schiller. But the English political event which aroused the greatest excitement and horror on the continent was the execution of Charles I in 1649. It was in this connexion, to anticipate a few years, that Milton first acquired fame or rather notoriety outside England as the defender of regicides.

The chief tribute to Charles I was the well-known tragedy of Gryphius, *Ermordete Majestät oder Carolus Stuardus König von Gross Britanien*, 1657. As the title implies, it is written entirely from the Royalist point of view. This is also the attitude of a considerable pamphlet-literature in prose and verse which accumulated round the subject. Two such pamphlets have been noticed by Mr Waterhouse, but there are many more in the British Museum, and these have just been collected and discussed by R. Priebsch in a paper entitled *German Pamphlets in Prose and Verse on the Trial and Death of Charles I*[1].

It was to be expected that philosophy would appeal strongly to the German mind, but one is hardly prepared to find that the first complete edition of Bacon's works appeared at 'Frankforth' as early as 1665. Bacon was held in high esteem in Germany during the seventeenth century, as is shown by numerous references to him on all sides. A Latin edition of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici* was also printed at Strassburg in 1652, but appears to have attracted little attention. The history of the importation of German theology to England belongs rather to the sixteenth century. But one work of Luther's, the *Colloquia Mensalia* or *Table Talk*, did not appear until 1652. The chief German theologian of the seventeenth century was Jakob Boehme, the shoemaker of Görlitz, and his *Morgenröthe im Aufgang* soon found its way to England. The theosophic nature of his philosophy accounts, no doubt, for his great popularity in this country, where regular societies of 'Behmenists' were formed. And his influence is not dead even to-day, for a treatise by the *Teutonicus Philosophus* was re-issued as recently as 1910, whilst numerous 'selections' and 'appreciations' have appeared in popular series[2]. The vogue of English theologians in Germany was even greater. In this field Mr Waterhouse has done some valuable pioneer work and has recorded no less than forty-eight German translations of English religious treatises, many of which went through five or six editions. The favourite authors were Joseph Hall and Richard Baxter.

The chapter on 'Later Travellers' is inadequate, and little more than a résumé of Schaible's *Geschichte der Deutschen in England* (1885), to whom, however, Mr Waterhouse duly acknowledges his obligations. But the careers of men like Ernst Gottlieb von Berge and Theodore Haake deserved more thorough investigation than the present author has accorded them. In this respect one of these, Samuel Hartlib, agriculturist and educationalist, the friend of Milton and the pensioner of the Commonwealth, has already met with adequate treatment at the hands of F. Althaus[3], a study which Mr Waterhouse has apparently overlooked.

Towards the end of the century, with the rise of German scholar-

[1] Contributed to *A Miscellany. Presented to J. M. Mackay*, Liverpool, 1914, p. 181.

[2] *The Signature of all things, with other Writings* in *Everyman's Library*, 1912; or the *Selections* ed. by C. A. Rainy in the *Library of the Soul*, 1907.

[3] *Samuel Hartlib. Ein deutsch-englisches Charakterbild* von Friedrich Althaus (*Historisches Taschenbuch*, VI. Folge, III, Leipzig, 1884).

ship under the influence of polyhistors like D. G. Morhof and Otto Menke, one of the founders of the Leipzig *Acta eruditorum*, a wider and more intelligent interest was taken in the English and their literature. From these two authors may be said to date the German awakening to the importance of English literature, which was to bear such fruit during the next century. But even in the seventeenth there are indications of a more intimate acquaintance with the works of individual poets; Dryden, especially as satirist, and the erotic lyric poets of the court of Charles II, found translators and imitators in Germany. It was not until the end of the century that Milton became known and appreciated on the continent, not, indeed, in the first place as a poet, but as the author of the *Eikonoklastes*. It is significant that the Germans, although their standpoint was perhaps less critical than that of the French or Italians, were the first people in Europe to appreciate Milton, the poet, at his true worth. And the importance of *Paradise Lost* is obvious, when we remember that it was over this work that the great battle between Gottsched and Bodmer raged for the rights of imagination in poetry. Forty years earlier than in any other country, a German translation appeared at Zerbst, namely in 1682, by Ernst Gottlieb von Berge. And even this was not the first, for two years earlier, Theodor Haake had finished his version in blank verse, and had circulated the manuscript among his friends. Thus Berge was able to make use of it, and very liberal use, as Mr Waterhouse shows by the parallels he prints. We are also indebted to him for extracts from German criticisms of the work. He might, however, have obtained a wider outlook on the question by a reference to J. G. Robertson's *Milton's Fame on the Continent*[1]. On Milton soon followed a knowledge of Shakespeare and other English classics, and through Klopstock and Lessing Germany passed on to the age of classic achievement.

In conclusion we must add a word on the bibliography. Though carefully drawn up on the whole, it is not, as we have seen, without its limitations. It seems superfluous to quote in full general works of reference such as *The Encyclopædia Britannica* or Professor Breul's *Handy Bibliographical Guide*. We all know that Gœdeke's *Grundriss* is indispensable to every investigator of German literature; and we do not expect to be referred to popular histories of German literature of the type of Kuno Francke's, or Vogt und Koch's or Schröer's little book on English literature in the *Sammlung Göschen*. And, finally, it seems hardly necessary to give us the pressmark of the Königlich-Preussische Bibliothek in Berlin. There is some justification for this in the case of rare books; but few of us, on this side of the North Sea at least, are likely to go to Berlin to consult Allibone's *Dictionary of British and American Authors*.

L. A. Willoughby.

Oxford.

[1] *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. III, 1908. A further contribution to the subject is E. Pizzo's *Milton's Verlornes Paradies im deutschen Urteile des* 18. *Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1914; but this study appeared subsequent to Mr Waterhouse's book.

MINOR NOTICES.

In *A Probable Italian Source of Shakespeare's 'Julius Cæsar'* (New York, 1913) Dr Alexander Boecker labours to show that Shakespeare's play owes something to Orlando Pescetti's *Cesare*, a Senecan tragedy, which was first printed at Verona in 1594. In saying that the evidence on which he relies is 'cumulative,' he admits that he has no very striking proof of indebtedness to bring forward: his whole case rests on very small or doubtful points, and its cumulative effect on one reader has not been great. Others, perhaps, may find it more convincing.

We may take one argument as an example.

> The reasons urged by Cassius [for killing Antony] are in substance exactly the same in Pescetti as in Shakespeare. They are either entirely absent, or only faintly indicated in scattered lines throughout Plutarch or Appian. The similarity is at times almost verbal. Thus Cassius says:
>
> E fuor degli occhi
> Tragghiamci questo stecco, che potrebbe,
> Quando che sia, non poca briga darne.
>
> Translated this reads:
>
> And from our eyes
> Let us pluck this thorn, which might
> Some time or other, cause us no little *annoyance*.
>
> Shakespeare makes Cassius exclaim:
>
> And you know his means
> If he improve them, may well stretch so far
> As to annoy us all.
>
> ... Pescetti [and] Shakespeare...agree in making Cassius urge the conspirators to kill him, for fear, that if spared, he might *annoy* them all. (p. 47)

Verbal resemblances may indeed be multiplied by recourse to this method of appropriate translation. Dr Boecker's dissertation is disfigured by occasional false forms—such as 'Hercules *Oetoeus*' (p. 58), 'the *Duke* of Essex' rebellion' (p. 79), 'Milthiades' (p. 86), 'paens of joy' (p. 103), 'Southhampton' (p. 120), 'the antipode of the promise' (p. 123).

He does not claim more for Pescetti as a dramatist than that he 'glimpsed the path' to Olympus. Nor does he think that Shakespeare necessarily read Pescetti at first hand. What was to prevent him, he asks, from employing 'lowly but learned hacks' to investigate plays or other works, both native and foreign, which promised to provide adequate material for his own dramas? There can be no answer to this question except that he was Shakespeare, a fact which is too often forgotten by writers of dissertations on the search for 'probable sources.'

G. C. M. S.

Mr Russell Smith has produced in *Harrington and his 'Oceana'* (Cambridge, University Press, 1914) a very interesting study, but one which only slightly concerns us in particular. Its interest is almost wholly historical, connected with an examination of Harrington's political system and an estimate of its influence in its own day, chiefly on the

constitutions of the American colonies, Carolina, New Jersey and Pennsylvania for example, and in a later time on the American Revolution through Adams, and on the political theories of the French Revolution through Sieyès. The *Oceana*, most practical of 'Utopias,' has little to do with literature, though it is cast in the form of a 'political romance.' It is a work of a different type altogether from Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia*, as the author of this book points out, and accordingly little attention is given by him to the literary form. The scene is laid really in England, and Cromwell is the hero of the story. He is represented under a transparent pseudonym as producing a new constitution, and then retiring into private life, leaving England a prosperous and contented republic. The book consists chiefly of the details of the proposed constitution, and as Mr Smith remarks, it has much more affinity with the *Laws* than with the *Republic* of Plato. Mr Russell Smith's work is well done, but he must allow us to make a single protest from the literary point of view. If he is to quote words of Plato as 'some of the most pathetic that were ever used in literature,' he really should render them more worthily. 'It doesn't matter, if it does or can exist,' is both colloquial and slip-shod.

As the fortieth volume of the 'Anglistische Forschungen' of Professor Hoops we have an edition of the *Medicina de Quadrupedibus* in its twelfth century form by M. Joseph Delcourt of the University of Montpellier (Heidelberg, Winter, 1914). This is the second part of the text published in the same series by H. Berberich in 1902, of which the third part was printed earlier by Löweneck in the 'Erlanger Beiträge' (1896). The eleventh century version of these texts was published in the first volume of Cockayne's *Leechdoms* etc., in the Rolls Series (1864). This 'early M.E. text' (which might equally well be called late O.E.) is contained in the British Museum MS. Harl. 6258, called in this edition (after Cockayne) MS. O. But we are never told this fact plainly, and the uninstructed reader will have a difficulty about identifying O with the Harleian MS. because reference is made (p. xii) to the MS. having been damaged in the Cotton fire, and no explanation is vouchsafed by the editor. The fact is, as the reader may discover by reference to Cockayne, that some leaves of MS. Harl. 6258 had strayed into the Cotton collection, and have now been restored, in a damaged condition, to their proper place. Similarly, though the editor refers to the other copies under the titles used by Cockayne, V, B, H, T, for example, he never tells us what manuscripts these letters stand for, and for this information too we have to refer to Cockayne's edition. Apart from these instances of carelessness, we have no particular fault to find with the edition. It has for its principal object the illustration of early M.E. grammar, and for this purpose the text (about twelve pages long) and the introduction are quite useful. Cockayne's translation is reprinted with some alterations: there might well have been more: it is difficult to see why 'hed-clað' should be translated 'frock,' 'wætan' (p. 20) can hardly mean 'nausea,' and 'mie' (p. 21) is not an English word. There are a few misprints, as 'harg-drawn' p. 11, 'vererem' p. 23.

VOLUME X APRIL, 1915 NUMBER 2

DANTE'S 'GENTILE DONNA'

I

The following essay will have no interest for those who believe that Dante's *Vita Nuova* is a systematic allegory, a work planned with less preparation than the *Commedia*, but with an intention similar in kind. To me the once formidable onslaughts of the allegorists seem to have been borne by the entrenchments of the so-called 'realists' without serious damage: all the important positions are still held. Among others the opinion that the lady to whom we are introduced in the thirty-fifth chapter, and who is commonly referred to as the 'donna gentile,' is a woman of flesh and blood, has not been shaken. Dante himself has taken care to protect the four sonnets, in which she is mentioned, from an allegorical interpretation, by saying explicitly of three of them that the sense is 'manifesto' and plain without explanation, and his exposition of the fourth contains no hint of allegory. Those who hold that she is a symbol of Philosophy have never been able to explain satisfactorily how the author's affection for her can be called 'avversario della ragione[1].'

On the other hand I can expect nothing better than pity from those who, like Cesareo[2], believe that the *Vita Nuova* is not an autobiography,

[1] The whole question is excellently discussed in D' Ancona's essay *Beatrice*, which has recently been re-edited in his *Scritti Danteschi*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1913: cf. also Menzio, P.A., *Il Traviamento Intellettuale di D. A., ecc.*, Livorno, Giusti, 1903. The controversy was still in the vigour of its youth during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and it continued briskly enough in the next few years, as will appear from the following references to allegorical interpretations of the *Vita Nuova*: Scrocca, A., *Il Peccato di Dante, ecc.*, Roma, Loescher, 1900 (where the allegory is only partial); Scarano, N., *Beatrice, ecc.*, Siena, Tip. Nava, 1902; Gargano-Cosenza, G., *Il Simbolo di Beatrice*, Messina, Muglia, 1903; Grasso, C., *La Beatrice di Dante*, Palermo, Reber, 1903; Zappia, E. V., *Studi sulla Vita Nuova di Dante*, Roma, Loescher, 1904; Grazzani, V., *Spiegazione dell' Allegoria della Vita Nuova, ecc.*, Città di Castello, Lapi, 1905; Beck, F., *Über die Wesensähnlichkeit zwischen Beatrice und die 'Donna Gentile,' etc.* in *Festschrift zum XII. allgemeinen deutschen Neuphilologentage in München*, ed. E. Stollreither, Erlangen, Junge, 1906; Cochin, H., *La Vita Nuova Trad. en Français, etc.*, Paris, Champion, 1908; Fletcher, J. B., *The Allegory of the Vita Nuova* in *Modern Philology*, July, 1913. The burden of the defence has been ably borne by Michele Barbi, in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* IX, pp. 30 f.; X, pp. 413–14; XI, pp. 369 f.; XII, pp. 204 f.

[2] *Vita Nuova*, ed. G. A. Cesareo, Messina, Principato, 1914. Cf. also *Un Romanzo d' Amore nel Secolo XIII*, in *Z. R. Ph.* XXX, pp. 681 f.

but a romance, in which the author's purpose is merely moral and aesthetic; in composing which he felt free to use, reject or alter the actual events of his own experience, and not obliged to consider the historical truth of anything he wrote. It would seem, however, that there is a sense in which even Cesareo believes the work to be an autobiography, that is an autobiography of mental experiences: the story of the author's ascent from a sensual to a highly intellectual, moral, and religious life, with the aid of divine grace represented in the person of Beatrice (*ed. cit.* p. LXXIII). I too believe that the *Vita Nuova* is an account of Dante's mental experiences rather than of merely external events, for these latter are evidently less important to the author than the former. But all the events of mental experience are given to us logically connected with events of physical experience, and as occurring in a definite order and manner, and the difference between Cesareo and his adversaries is that he has no faith in the *historical* truth of the narrative[1].

If we, who disagree with the editor, offer in evidence the first words of the *Vita Nuova*, in which the author says that he is about to relate only his recollections, we expose ourselves to ridicule: we are, it seems, too ingenuous. Do we believe everything in *Robinson Crusoe*, in the *Confession d'un Enfant du Siècle*, in the adventures of Münchhausen, we are asked (p. LXIII). We answer that these are somewhat modern examples, and we are tempted to ask in return whether there are any mediaeval works which are represented by the authors to be autobiographical, and are nevertheless altogether fictitious: are the *Confessions* of St Augustine, for instance, nothing but romance? It seems to me that Cesareo's chief mistake is in attributing to Dante a modern idea, the idea that a work of art may pretend to be autobiography without any deceit intended or practised on the reader, and yet relate nothing that is historically true.

Cesareo lays before us, with evident relish, a long list of difficulties which, according to him, confront the 'realist' in interpreting the *Vita Nuova*. Far be it from me to minimize those that actually exist, but the fact remains that they are neither as many nor as great as the editor would have us believe. Most of these vanish if we admit, as we readily do, what Cesareo himself says on pp. XLVII–XLVIII, that Dante composed this work in a state of mind quite different from any he had experienced before the last vision of Beatrice: 'Uscito appena di questa prodigiosa esaltazione, l' Amante narra la sua storia; ma egli è ancora

[1] This with some important exceptions, cf. p. LXVII.

sospeso nel sogno, la mente protesa di là dalla realtà, il cuore tremante di stupore e d' adorazione, gli occhi assorti nel doppio mistero della morte e dell' infinito.' Dante was writing in a fever of newly-aroused devotion to the memory of his dead love, now in heaven and caring for him. He was looking upon the whole period of his early youth with a new perspective, and an imaginative intuition of the meaning of it all, which he had seemed to understand but gradually. Memory and imagination are closely-related faculties of the mind: we imagine memories, and remember and recollect nothing but images.

If we consider the poet's state of mind when he was composing the book, we need not be astonished at his recollection of the first meeting with Beatrice, when he was nine years old. Barbi has admitted that this may be invention[1], but it does not seem necessary to admit even that. At any rate that the appearance of a beautiful little girl should make an extraordinary impression on a little boy of nine—which impression he may unconsciously exaggerate when he recollects it years later, in the light of many other astonishing subsequent events—is not unnatural. Dante himself foresees the doubt in the mind of the reader, and suppresses other memories, or what seem to him memories, of this tender age: 'E perocchè soprastare alle passioni ed atti di tanta gioventude pare alcuno parlare fabuloso, mi partirò da esse; e trapassando molte cose, le quali si potrebbero trarre dall' esemplo onde nascono queste, verrò a quelle parole, le quali sono scritte nella mia memoria sotto maggiori paragrafi' (*V.N.* § 2). If Dante had considered himself free to invent as much as he pleased, would he have written these words? At any rate it is clear that he desired to be believed literally.

So too, considering the poet's thoughts and feelings when he was writing his commentary on the first sonnet, it is not astonishing that he should see in the verses which had been only a fashionable puzzle, a prophecy of the death of Beatrice, nor is it strange that he should see in verses written for the first lady 'of the defence,' and without reference to Beatrice, apparent references which would seem to him miraculous, as also it would seem miraculous that he had happened to place Beatrice ninth in his lost 'serventese.' He was probably thinking of the whole of his adolescence as miraculously guided, and he was ready to find extraordinary significance in all the verses he had written during that period and in all the events to which they belonged. This attitude of mind is plain in his explanation of the part played by nines

[1] *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* xi, pp. 3–6.

in his young life. Cesareo makes much of these nines, and thinks they go to prove that most of the events of the *Vita Nuova* have been invented, but Dante offers his explanation of them humbly, suggesting that others may see in them significances which he may have missed (*V. N.* § 29). His attitude is one of simple, ingenuous astonishment that the more he reflects the more nines seem to have been connected with the events of his young life[1]. It is certainly significant that in the date of the death of Beatrice, which Dante could easily have arranged so as to avoid having to seek in the Arabian and Syrian calendars for nines, even Cesareo is obliged to recognize an historical fact.

Similarly other difficulties vivaciously presented to us, especially incongruities between the poems and the commentary, melt away in the light of a reasonable consideration of the author's altered perspective at the time when he was composing the commentary, and others which still remain are just as stubborn as before, when looked at from the editor's point of view. For example, the story in §§ 32 and 33, in which the brother of Beatrice has been supposed to figure, is obscure enough, but it remains none the less obscure if we accept Cesareo's opinion that the episode was invented by Dante merely to give variety to the tale of the *Vita Nuova*, and so revive the flagging interest of the reader. In fact all the obscurities and incongruities become still more inexplicable if we believe that the author was free to alter, rearrange, and invent the contents and expression of both verse and prose, unhampered by any consideration for historical truth: for in that case, an artist such as Cesareo himself declares him to be, ought to have done better[2].

But part of what the Sicilian poet and scholar says on pages XXVIII and XXIX, about the 'donna gentile,' must appeal to everyone as reasonable. He says in effect, and among other things: If the 'donna gentile' were a living woman in the *Vita Nuova*, but in the *Convivio* an attempt were made to pass her off as Philosophy, Dante would at least have arranged the chronology and other data he gives us so as to agree with what is said in the *Vita Nuova*, and would not have made it impossible for his readers to believe him.

It is, I think, undeniable that the apparent contradiction between the story of the 'donna gentile' in the *Vita Nuova* and that in the

[1] President Wilson is amused at the coincidence of the number 13 in so many of the dates of his life: Dante would have considered it miraculous, and would have patiently sought for the explanation.

[2] *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* XXI, fasc. 1, containing Parodi's review of Cesareo, did not reach me until I was on the point of sending this essay to the *Modern Language Review*. It is at least encouraging to find that some of my objections to the views of the editor are substantially the same as those of the reviewer.

Convivio, is inadmissible. It is inconceivable, I think, that Dante should, in the *Convivio*, flatly contradict what he had already said in the *Vita Nuova*, at the same time referring the reader to that former account. In justice to the author, it should be the endeavour of the student of these works to explain that contradiction which can only be an illusion[1]. The hope of contributing to such an explanation is my only excuse for reopening so hackneyed a question as this.

The information given us by Dante regarding the 'donna gentile' is chiefly contained in four documents, namely: the account in §§ 35 to 39 of the *Vita Nuova*[2]; the 'canzone' *Voi che intendendo*; the exposition of the literal meaning of this poem, especially in *Convivio* II, 2, and lastly, the exposition of the allegorical meaning, especially in *Convivio* II, 13[3]. Some confusion has been induced in the discussion of the whole problem, by failing to separate *Voi che intendendo* from its commentary in the *Convivio*. Written, as I hope to show, after the *Vita Nuova* was finished, and long before the *Convivio* was begun, it stands by itself, a document of distinctive importance. Let us examine these four documents in the order in which they have been mentioned, which is, I believe, the order of their composition.

As it is certainly unnecessary to rehearse the account of the 'donna gentile' in the *Vita Nuova*, I shall limit myself to a few points which are essential to the discussion that follows.

The lady first appears to the poet with an expression of extraordinary pity, so that his eyes are moved to weep. The tears rise from his heart, which has been deeply disturbed by that look of pity[4]: 'mi riguardava sì pietosamente, quanto a la vista, che tutta la pietà parea in lei accolta.' The expression 'quanto a la vista' indicates that something more than pity may have been in the lady's mind, and at any rate, immediately after seeing her, Dante avows the belief: 'E' non puote essere che con quella pietosa donna non sia nobilissimo amore.' This belief haunts the poet until the end of the episode, but it is far from being a certainty. In § 36 he says that her colour was *almost like* that of love—'sì si facea d' una vista pietosa e d' un colore pallido *quasi come d' amore*,' and in the following sonnet (*Color d' amore*) he

[1] This seems to have been the opinion of Gaspary: cf. *Z. R. Ph.* VII, p. 613.

[2] References to the *Vita Nuova* are to the edition of Barbi.

[3] The information contributed by the 'canzone' *Amor che nella mente* and its commentary is relatively slight; that comparatively small contribution will not, however, be neglected.

[4] § 35, sonnet *Videro gli occhi*, vv. 9–11.

says that never did a lady's face take on the colour of love and appearance of pity as does hers when she looks on him; in § 37 he argues against his eyes: '...questa donna...non mira voi, se non in quanto le pesa de la gloriosa donna di cui piangere solete.' At times he feels that the lady must have been sent by Love (§ 38, 'apparita *forse* per volontade d' Amore') only to reject the thought immediately. It is always the poet's heart that is inclined to yield to the thought that she must be accompanied by 'most noble Love,' his heart which, after at first rebuking the wayward eyes, does yield to that thought, and then urges it upon his stubborn reason; the heart which, we are told in § 38, represents desire ('appetito'). On the other hand, the author's 'anima' (which represents reason, § 38) never falters in its constancy to Beatrice; it is barely aware of, and only annoyed by, the thought which has overcome the heart[1], and when (§ 39) the 'forte imaginazione' arises to recall the memory of Beatrice, it is only the heart and the eyes which are obliged to repent, not the 'anima': 'lo mio cuore cominciò dolorosamente a pentere de lo desiderio a cui sì vilmente s' avea lasciato possedere alquanti dì contra la costanza de la ragione:....' In a word: the eyes yield at once and cause the heart, after a short struggle, to capitulate completely, but the 'anima' is constant and inflexible until the end when it triumphs. Reason refuses to admit that Love is on the side of the compassionate lady[2].

Twice in this account of the *Vita Nuova* occurs the word 'mente': a word which will come up for discussion later: in the sonnet *Color d' amore*: 'sì che per voi mi ven cosa a la *mente*—ch' io temo forte non lo cor si schianti,' where it is evidently used in the sense of 'memory,' a frequent meaning in the *Vita Nuova*, as has been pointed out by Melodia[3], and in the sonnet *Gentil pensero*: 'L' anima dice al cor: "Chi è costui—che vene a consolar la nostra *mente*—ed è la sua vertù tanto possente—ch' altro penser non lascia star con nui?"' In this second passage it seems to have a more general meaning corresponding to the English *mind*.

The resemblance between the story of the 'donna gentile' in the *Vita Nuova*, and the sonnet *Per quella via* in which appears the *Lisetta*

[1] Cf. § 38: '...il cuore consentiva...E quando io avea consentito ciò e io mi ripensava sì come da la ragione mosso, e dicea fra me medesimo; "Deo che pensiero è questo ecc.,"' and son. *Gentil pensero*: 'L' anima dice al cor: "Chi è costui, che viene a consolar la nostra mente...?"' Cf. Manacorda in *G. S. L. It.* XLII, p. 197, n. 1.

[2] Cf. Azzolina, *Il Dolce Stil Nuovo*, Palermo, 1903, p. 184: 'E Amore che fa?; prende parte in codesto? Nessuna; è semplice supposizione che esso c' influisca; "Questa è una donna gentile, bella, giovane e savia, ed apparita *forse* per volontà d' Amore,...."'

[3] *La V. N. di D. A.*, Milano, 1906, pp. 9 ff.

discovered by Barbi, has often been pointed out[1]. So long as the doubt remains whether Lisetta may not be the same as the 'Isabetta' mentioned in the correspondence between Dante and Giovanni Quirini[2], it will be impossible to decide whether she is the 'donna gentile,' but to me it seems probable, as it did to Barbi, and does still to some eminent authorities. The objection of Zenatti that the 'donna gentile' is not aggressive, while Lisetta is described as advancing 'baldanzosamente,' is sufficiently met by the reply of Barbi[3], and by Manacorda[4] who notes that Dante uses the words 'baldanza d' amore a segnoreggiare me' in speaking of Beatrice in his memory (in *V. N.* § 2).

In this sonnet 'Lisetta' carries everything before her until she reaches the tower 'che s' apre quando l' anima consente,' when she is rejected as was the 'donna gentile.' Both are rejected without hesitation by the 'anima,' which in the *Vita Nuova* stands for 'reason,' and certainly the tower in this sonnet is an intellectual fortress of some kind. Here again the word 'mente' is used in a sense which is as difficult to define as in the *Vita Nuova*. It occurs first in verse 2, 'Per quella via che la bellezza corre—quando a chiamar Amor va nella *mente*,' and again in verse 9, 'chè donna dentro nella *mente* siede,' and here it seems to be used in the sense it has in the expression 'donna de la mia mente' (of *Vita Nuova* § 2)[5]. A striking resemblance to the story of the 'donna gentile' is to be seen in the circumstance that Love is entirely on the side of the rival of Lisetta, as he is on the side of Beatrice in the *Vita Nuova*: 'Quando Lisetta accomiatar si vede—da quella parte dove Amore alberga, tutta dipinta di vergogna riede.'

In the 'canzone' *Voi che intendendo* we find a situation similar to that described in the story of the 'donna gentile' in the *Vita Nuova*. There can be no doubt that this poem is concerned with the same persons as that story. The verses of the second stanza:

> Solea esser vita dello cor dolente
> Un soave pensier, che se ne gìa
> Molte fiate a' pie' del vostro sire;
> Ove una donna gloriar vedìa,
> Di cui parlava a me sì dolcemente,
> Che l' anima diceva: I' men vo' gire[6],

[1] Cf. Barbi, *Due Noterelle Dantesche*, Firenze, Carnesecchi, 1898 (per nozze Rostagno-Cavazza); D' Ancona, *Della Pargoletta ecc.* in *N. Ant.* 1 aprile, 1912, and references given there; Del Lungo, *Lisetta* in *Rass Cont.* ottobre, 1912.

[2] Cf. Barbi in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* x, p. 408. [3] *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* viii, pp. 320–1.

[4] *G. S. L. It.* xlii, p. 198.

[5] We shall see that in the *Convivio*, when Dante has become a thorough-going philosopher, the word is used and defined in a specifically scholastic sense.

[6] Moore, *Tutte le opere, ecc.*, Oxford, 1904, p. 251. References to the *Convivio* are, throughout, to this edition.

cannot fail to be recognized as a reference to the last sonnet of the *Vita Nuova*:

> Oltre la spera che più larga gira
> Passa 'l sospiro ch' esce del mio core[1]:
> Intelligenza nova, che l' Amore
> Piangendo mette in lui, pur su lo tira.
> Quand' elli è giunto là dove disira,
> Vede una donna, che riceve onore,
> E luce sì, che per lo suo splendore
> Lo peregrino spirito la mira[2].

The 'donna' whom the ascending 'pensier' used to see in glory is therefore, Beatrice. Nor can there be any doubt that 'chi fa fuggire, the above-mentioned 'pensier' (that is the 'spiritel d' amor gentile' of verse 42), is the 'Gentile pensero, che parla di vui,' of the *Vita Nuova*, or that the 'donna' of v. 23, which 'questi mi face...guardare,' is the 'donna gentile' herself. Here, as in the *Vita Nuova*, the new thought argues persuasively with the reluctant 'anima' of the poet, pointing out the attractions of the new lady: 'Mira quant' ella è pietosa ed umile,—Saggia e cortese, ecc.' (vv. 46–7)[3], and declaring that Love is on her side: 'Che tu dirai: Amor, signor verace,—Ecco l' ancella tua; fa che ti piace.' (vv. 51–2.)

The reference to the sonnet *Oltre la spera* seems to make it certain that *Voi che intendendo* was written after the *Vita Nuova* had been finished: but there are other reasons which confirm this conclusion, and have an additional importance of their own. The situation in the 'canzone' is similar to that in the *Vita Nuova*, but it is not identical: there is an important difference. We saw that in the former work the 'anima' of the poet was not only never persuaded that the 'donna gentile' was accompanied by 'Amore,' that Love was on her side, but maintained an impenetrable confident reserve strongly in contrast with the attitude of the poet's heart, which surrendered entirely and afterwards was obliged to repent bitterly. Here in *Voi che intendendo*, the 'anima' has not yet, it is true, quite consented to the persuasion of the new thought, but it is far from being confidently hostile. It merely weeps and complains, reluctant to abandon the thought of Beatrice, but evidently foreseeing that it will soon be obliged to do so:

> L' anima piange, sì *ancor* len duole,
> E dice: Oh lassa me, *come si fugge*
> Questo pietoso che m' ha consolata! (vv. 30–2.)

[1] 'Sospiro' is rendered 'pensero' in the prose of the *V. N.*

[2] This reference is noted by Zingarelli, *Dante*, Milano, F. Vallardi, p. 131.

[3] Cf. *V. N.* § 38: 'Questa è una donna gentile, bella, giovane e savia, ecc.' and the sonnet *Gentil pensero*, vv. 12–14: '..., e tutto 'l suo valore,—mosse de li occhi di quella pietosa—che si turbava de' nostri martiri.'

The 'anima' is on the very verge of capitulation; it admits now that its first impression, recorded in the *Vita Nuova*, that 'nobilissimo Amore' was in the company of the 'donna gentile,' was true, and complains unavailingly of the eyes:

> Io dicea ben: Negli occhi di costei[1]
> De' star colui che le mie pari uccide:
> E non mi valse ch' io ne fossi accorta
> Che non mirasser tal, ch' io ne son morta. (vv. 36–9.)

On the other hand, the words of the new thought express an altogether novel confidence of victory: 'E pensa di chiamarla Donna omai' (v. 48). For that matter the words of the first stanza concede all the contention of the new thought in the *Vita Nuova*, that the new lady has appeared by the command of Love, for the whole 'canzone' is addressed to the Intelligences of the sphere of Venus, and its last two verses affirm the concession:

> E come un spirto contro a lei favella,
> Che vien pe' raggi della vostra stella.

Voi che intendendo, then, presents a second chapter in the story of the 'donna gentile,' for the doubt which led to her rejection in the first chapter, has been dissipated: she has now appeared supported by Love, and the 'anima' is about to consent to the new sovereignty.

This 'canzone' is usually referred to as the first of the allegorical poems of Dante. Was it written with an allegorical intention? I think it was. Without detracting from the impression of a greater intellectual inspiration here than in the sonnets of the *Vita Nuova*, which many students of Dante have seemed to perceive[2], there are more objective reasons for believing it to be an allegory. The expression in vv. 24–5 'Chi veder vuol la salute,—Faccia che gli occhi d' esta Donna miri,' is enough to arouse the suspicion. The quality of 'grandeur' ascribed to the 'donna gentile' in v. 47: 'Saggia e cortese nella sua grandezza': seems inapplicable properly to the damsel of the *Vita Nuova*. The 'commiato' which speaks of the unusual obscurity of the poem, 'Tanto la parli faticosa e forte,' seems to imply something more than the mere difficulty of interpreting the literal meaning, mentioned in *Convivio* II, 12, especially since the readers, who could hardly fail to recognize the connexion with the story in the *Vita Nuova*, would have in that story an adequate commentary by which to interpret the 'canzone.'

[1] This reading seems to me more acceptable than the 'Io dicea: Ben ecc.' of the edition quoted.

[2] Cf. e.g. Zingarelli, *op. cit.* p. 131.

There does indeed seem to be some new, hidden meaning in the poem, which the reader, at the time when it was written, would be unable to understand. I shall undertake to show presently that the 'canzone' was written in 1293, and if, for the time being, we suppose (no new supposition) that this date is correct, we shall see that it was written not very long after the *Vita Nuova* was finished. The reader who was already acquainted with the *Vita Nuova* would naturally suppose that the new lady spoken of in the 'canzone' was the 'donna gentile' of the 'libello.' No other solution would be open to him, since it would be impossible for him to suppose that the author, manifestly referring to the *Vita Nuova* and representing a situation analogous to the former story, could be speaking of an entirely different lady. This reader would assume that Dante had now renewed his attachment to the 'donna gentile,' which had appeared short-lived in the *Vita Nuova*. And if the 'donna gentile' be 'Lisetta,' then the Florentine reader would assume that Dante had renewed his former temporary relation with Lisetta.

And here the sonnet of Aldobrandino da Padova[1] in reply to Dante's *Per quella via* acquires a new interest, for whatever the difficulties in interpreting that sonnet may be, there can be no doubt that the author is bent on explaining away the harshness of the rebuff administered to Lisetta in Dante's sonnet: a rebuff which may have been the subject of common and malicious gossip[2]. He explains why the voice ordered her away, and he seems to mean that Dante was unable to believe that the advances of Lisetta were inspired by true love, in other words that Dante could not believe that she was supported by 'Amore.' Therefore, when she approached, the voice cried: 'Alla rocca non s' erga—infin a tanto che 'l Sir nol concede,' —that is, 'let her not come up to the fortress until such time as the master grants his permission.' But Aldobrandino, who is taking the side of Lisetta, evidently thinks it likely that the time will come when the master (probably the same as Dante's 'anima') will give his consent, and Lisetta will be admitted within the fortress. Concluding his commentary Del Lungo says: 'Passò Lisetta dentro la rocca, avverando il presagio del pietoso Capitano? Ciò a noi poco importa sapere.'

Possibly. Yet I confess that I personally should much like to know

[1] Cf. Del Lungo in *Rass. Cont.* ottobre, 1912.

[2] Del Lungo interprets the verses: 'e dargli guida nel cammin dolente—che la conduca fuor di cruda gente,' as follows: 'e guidarla in quel suo doloroso tornare indietro, per modo che essa possa disimpacciarsi dalle scortesi persone che si farebbero beffe di lei...,' *op. cit.* p. 10.

the answer which is so inaccessible. But since no conclusion can be founded on what is mere conjecture—namely, that Lisetta and the 'donna gentile' are the same—I pass on to the examination of the third document in the history of our 'noble lady,' content with having pointed out that, although in *Voi che intendendo* she seems to be an allegorical symbol, the contemporary reader could not possibly have understood the allegory, and so Dante must have intended him to understand the only possible literal meaning, that is that the author had again become enthralled by the 'donna gentile,' and was on the point of recognizing her as his mistress. It was not until years after that the allegory was explained, and by that time it had become more elaborate than had been at first intended.

Dante begins his explanation of the literal meaning of *Voi che intendendo*, in *Convivio* II, 2, as follows: 'Cominciando adunque, dico che la stella di Venere due fiate era rivolta in quello suo cerchio che la fa parere serotina e mattutina, secondo i due diversi tempi, appresso lo trapassamento di quella Beatrice beata, che vive in cielo con gli angioli, e in terra colla mia anima, quando quella gentil Donna, di cui feci menzione nella fine della *Vita Nuova*, apparve primamente accompagnata d' Amore agli occhi miei, e prese alcun luogo nella mia mente.'

The date indicated by the two revolutions of Venus is August of 1293, as has been finally demonstrated after much debate[1]. Now since the poet tells us here that he is speaking of the 'gentil Donna' already mentioned in the *Vita Nuova*, and in that work (§§ 34–35) he has told us that this lady appeared for the first time soon after June of 1291, the date he gives us here so emphatically (August, 1293) is not that of her earliest appearance, but of the time when she first appeared 'accompagnata d' Amore agli occhi miei, e prese alcun luogo nella mia mente.' What do these words mean?

Zingarelli, in his excellent work on Dante[2] says: 'Egli [Dante] vuol portarci al tempo in cui nacque la sua canzone, cioè quando la donna gentile teneva un luogo nel suo cuore, ma non era divenuta ancor padrona, quando il pensiero della filosofia discacciava il ricordo di Beatrice, ma non l' aveva ancora fugato e allontanato.' An appropriate preliminary objection to this explanation would be that the passage in question speaks of Dante's 'mente' not 'cuore,' and we shall see that

[1] Cf. Angelitti in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* VIII, pp. 209 f. and *Sulle Principali Apparenze del Pianeta Venere.* (*Estr. d. Atti d. R. Acc.* s. 3. vol. VI.) Palermo, 1901. Barbi in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* X, pp. 314–316 and XII, p. 212.

[2] *Op. cit.* pp. 132–3.

the word 'mente' has a peculiar significance which is important here. Also it would be no new thing for the lady to have a place in Dante's heart, for we have seen that his heart was entirely hers already in 1291, according to the *Vita Nuova*.

Barbi, reviewing the work of Zingarelli[1], says that in this passage 'ha voluto Dante determinarci quando, a partire dalla morte di Beatrice, cominciò a sentire la dolcezza della filosofia.' This explanation is derived from what Dante himself tells us eleven chapters further on (*Convivio* II, 13), when he comes to his exposition of the allegory of the 'canzone,' but it does not help us to understand the meaning of this passage in *Convivio* II, 2, where Dante is explaining the literal meaning. It is essential that we should put ourselves in the position of the reader. Let us suppose that we, like him, had read the *Vita Nuova* and *Voi che intendendo*, and were now reading the *Convivio* for the first time. We are told that the lady spoken of in the poem is the 'donna gentile' of the *Vita Nuova* (precisely as we should have supposed), and that in August 1293 she appeared for the first time 'accompagnata d' Amore.' Knowing that throughout the story in the *Vita Nuova* the poet had never admitted that the 'donna gentile' was accompanied by Love, and that, on the contrary, in *Voi che intendendo* it is admitted, and the poet's 'anima' is on the point of surrendering completely to the lady, we should conclude that we had interpreted the 'canzone' correctly in the main, and that Dante, after rejecting the lady in 1291, because he could not believe that she was commended to him by Love, had become reconciled to her in 1293, or at least was on the point of becoming reconciled. Not for a moment could it occur to us (that is to the reader) that Philosophy had anything to do with this story, for the author had given us no hint of such a possibility. As for the expression 'prese alcun luogo nella mia mente,' we (that is the reader) might be in doubt as to the exact meaning of 'mente,' but we should conclude that the lady had obtained some hold upon the mind of the poet, as well as upon his heart, and that all that was lacking for her complete triumph was the conquest of the whole of his mind.

I think it will be admitted that I have described the only possible view of the meaning of this passage, that the reader of the *Convivio* could take, and if so, it follows that Dante foresaw that the reader would take that view, and intended that he should. If, then, we who have already read the whole of the *Convivio* are bent on understanding the author's meaning in this place, we should abstain from reading into

[1] In *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* XI, p. 11.

it the allegory explained in *Convivio* II, 13, that allegory which Dante refrained from explaining until later.

It may be contended, no doubt, that this reader, with whom I am showing so much sympathy, had at any rate been warned in *Convivio* I, 1, not to believe the literal meaning of *Voi che intendendo.* He had been warned that the allegorical meaning, which is to be explained later, is the only true meaning, and so, even if he could not know that the lady is Philosophy, at any rate he would be on his guard against Dante's explanation of the literal sense. In the words of Barbi[1]: '...non si sforza...Dante nel Convivio a far credere che quell' amore che manifestò per una donna pietosa negli ultimi paragrafi della Vita Nuova e nelle canzoni scritte dipoi, fu tutto una finzione (II, 13), e che la donna di cui innamorò appresso la morte di Beatrice fu realmente la Filosofia (II, 16)? Se egli mostrò *la sua condizione sotto figura di altre cose* (II, 13), se la sentenza vera non è quella della lettera, ma quella ch' egli s' appresta a rivelare ora coll' interpretazione allegorica (I, 1, 2; II, 13), cioè che non passione ma virtù fu la movente cagione del suo poetare dopo la morte di Beatrice, vuol dire che anche nella sua poesia la lettera altro non era che *una bella menzogna,* e che la verità veniva data solo dal senso allegorico, come appunto afferma quando dichiara teoricamente i quattro sensi cui vanno intese le scritture (II, 1)[2].'

The references which Barbi makes to *Convivio* II, 13 and 16 will be considered when we come to deal with Dante's exposition of the allegory. I shall at present confine myself to the arguments deduced from *Convivio* I and II. And first let us consider Barbi's contention that, since Dante tells us that the interpretation of the allegory will show that the poems in question were inspired by 'virtù' not by 'passione,' therefore the allegorical is the only true interpretation.

He cites the latter part of the passage of *Convivio* I, 2, which is as follows: 'Temo la infamia di tanta passione avere seguita, quanta concepe chi legge le soprannominate canzoni in me avere signoreggiato. La quale infamia si cessa per lo presente di me parlare interamente; lo quale mostra che non passione ma virtù si è stata la movente cagione,' and he connects these words with that other passage from *Convivio* I, 1, where Dante says: 'E conciossiacosachè la vera intenzione mia fosse altra che quella che di fuori mostrano le Canzoni predette, per allegorica sposizione quelle intendo mostrare, appresso la litterale storia ragionata.'

[1] In *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* x, p. 322.

[2] I have corrected the references in brackets, which are misprinted in three places of the text.

Barbi evidently supposes that it is the promised explanation of the allegory that is to make it clear that the poems were born not of passione' but of 'virtù,' a view which seems to me mistaken.

It has already been pointed out by Max Rieger[1] that 'virtù' is defined by Dante himself in *Convivio* IV, 20, as follows: 'Il perso è un colore misto di purpureo e di nero, ma vince il nero, e da lui si denomina: e così la Virtù è una cosa mista di Nobiltà e di passione; ma perchè la Nobiltà vince quella, è la Virtù denominata da essa, e appellata Bontà.' 'Virtù,' then, is the same as 'Bontà,' and is a mixture of 'passione' and 'nobiltà,' in which the latter predominates. What Dante feared was that the poems on which he intended to comment had been misunderstood as inspired by 'passione' without 'nobiltà.' Now in the earlier part of *Convivio* I, 1, he had said: 'La vivanda di questo Convito sarà di quattordici maniere ordinata, cioè quattordici Canzoni sì di amore come di virtù materiate, le quali senza lo presente pane aveano d' alcuna scurità ombra, sicchè a molti lor bellezza, più che lor bontà, era in grado.' 'Lo presente pane,' that is the commentary, is not only the allegorical but the literal explanation also, and that he is not here speaking of the allegorical explanation alone is shown by the fact that later on in the same chapter he begins for the first time to speak of that allegorical explanation, in the words of the passage quoted: 'E conciossiacosachè la vera intenzione mia fosse altra, ecc.' If Barbi's supposition were correct, this last sentence would be a useless repetition of what had been said before. And the same useless repetition would occur in the other passage from *Convivio* I, 2, which I have quoted, and which Barbi quotes in part, for immediately after saying: 'La quale infamia si cessa per lo presente di me parlare interamente; lo quale mostra che non passione ma virtù si è stata la movente cagione,' Dante continues: 'Intendo *anche* mostrare la *vera* sentenza di quelle, che per alcuno vedere non si può, s' io non la conto, perchè è nascosa sotto figura d' allegoria[2].'

[1] *Über Dantes Lyrik*, in *Nachrichten d. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Philol. Hist. Kl.*, 1899. Heft 4, pp. 463–473.

[2] Rieger, however, might have made his demonstration complete by quoting the end of the literal explanation of *Voi che intendendo* (*Convivio* II, 12): 'E perciò dico al presente, che la *bontà* e la *bellezza* di ciascuno sermone sono intra loro partite e diverse; chè la bontà è nella sentenza, e la bellezza nell' ornamento delle parole: e l' una e l' altra è con diletto; avvegnachè la bontade sia massimamente dilettosa. Onde conciossiacosachè la *bontà* di questa Canzone fosse malagevole a sentire, per le diverse persone che in essa s' inducono a parlare, dove si richieggono molte distinzioni, e la *bellezza* fosse agevole a vedere, parvemi mestiere alla Canzone che per gli altri si ponesse più mente alla bellezza che alla bontà.' We have seen that Dante himself says that 'virtù' and 'bontà' are the same, and here much is said about the 'bontà' but nothing about the allegorical meaning, the explanation of which begins with the following chapter.

It is not, then, the 'virtù' of the 'canzoni' that is explained by the allegorical interpretation, but what Dante calls their 'verità,' and here we must admit that it is true that—as Barbi points out with his other citations—Dante calls the words of *Voi che intendendo* 'fittizie'; that he refers to the allegorical 'sposizione' as the 'vera,' and that in *Convivio* II, 1 he has described the allegorical sense of literature ('le scritture') as 'una verità ascosa sotto bella menzogna.'

Here, again, it is proper to recall the remarks of Rieger[1] who directs attention to the fact that, according to Dante, all 'scritture' have an allegorical sense which is the true sense *par excellence* ('vera') and also a literal sense which, considered with regard to the allegorical meaning, is 'fittizia.' But the expression 'bella menzogna' cannot be used to show that the literal meaning of *Voi che intendendo* is false, for in that case we should have to admit that the astronomical information contained in the literal exposition of the first verse is also false, and also that none of Dante's love poems represent any historical event. That much abused expression is, on the contrary, to be understood in the light of its context where it is used with reference to the mythological stories of the classic poets, and particularly the story of Orpheus, which is used as an illustration. 'Wenn für Dante jede scrittura, die etwas tatsächliches angiebt, der allegorischen Auslegung fähig ist,' says Rieger, 'so gilt ihm diese für die wahrhafte, la vera sentenza, weil sie der tatsächlichen Angabe eine für die Vernunft wertvolle Wahrheit entlockt; über die Wahrhaftigkeit aber der Angabe selbst ist damit kein Urteil gegeben.' And the German critic is led to the conclusion that no love-poem of Dante could have been written merely, or in the first place, for the sake of the allegory[2].

It is unfortunate that the manuscripts of the *Convivio* do not give us in full Dante's views on the literal sense of 'le scritture.' It is possible that in *Convivio* II, 1, the poet expressed himself far more clearly than does the text in its present condition. It has been reasonably argued more than once that, according to Dante, there can be no allegory without a literal sense founded on historical reality[3], and it

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 468–9.

[2] It would appear from this conclusion, which I hold to be sound, that according to Dante all the poems of the *Vita Nuova* are susceptible of an allegorical interpretation, and indeed that they are so susceptible has been shown by the numerous plausible interpretations constructed by our adversaries, the so-called 'allegorists.' Dante would not have frowned on such interpretations, but he would have raised 'le ciglia un poco in soso' on hearing that he was credited with having had them in mind either when he wrote the poems, or later.

[3] Cf. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, second series, Oxford, 1899, p. 132: 'It would, we maintain, be an utter anachronism to suppose in Dante, or other writers of that age,

is worth noting that the classical mythology itself (unbelievable as it was to Christian minds) should properly be classed as historical reality, since it is part of human information, honestly believed in at one time: Ovid did not invent the story of Orpheus, and the latter was an historical personage to Dante, as Flamini has reminded us[1]. Whatever else is in doubt it is at least certain that Dante did not mean to say that the literal sense of all writings which have also an allegorical sense, is historically false. He no doubt looked upon the *Aeneid* as a complete allegory, but it is not therefore to be supposed that he believed Virgil to have invented Aeneas and his wanderings. The distinction made in *Convivio* II, 1 between theologians and poets is that the former deal with the holy scriptures, every word of which is always absolutely true, whereas secular poems need only to be founded on fact.

With regard to the foundation of fact underlying *Voi che intendendo*, we are indebted to Flamini's study of the allegory in the *Commedia* for an observation of the greatest importance. We are there warned that there are parts in the *Commedia* which contain information as to facts necessary for the understanding of the tale, both in its literal and allegorical senses, which are historically true and yet are neither allegory nor poetic fiction. For example, the story of Dante's faithlessness told by Beatrice in the earthly paradise, is necessary for the information of the reader, and it is historically true, unlike the story of Dante's encounter with the beasts in the 'selva oscura' or other parts of the narrative of his journey. 'Conviene ben distinguere,...gli antefatti dell' azione dall' azione stessa: questa è una favola o finzione poetica, quelli sono o vogliono essere, storica verità,...[2].' These 'antefatti' constitute the foundation of fact underlying the story of the *Commedia*. They are introductory in character, and later on (p. 57, n. 3) Flamini refers us (if I understand him correctly) to another example of them in *Convivio* II, 13—that chapter in which Dante, before undertaking the explanation of the allegory of *Voi che intendendo*, informs us as to how he first conceived the idea of writing that allegory. *Convivio* II, 13 is a chapter introductory to the commentary on the allegorical sense of the poem: it contains no comment

an allegory constructed without a basis of fact.' And p. 134: 'The only possible or apparent exception that occurs to one is the nameless "donna gentile," who typefied to Dante Philosophy....But it is not to be assumed, nor do I for a moment believe, that she is any exception to Dante's usual practice.' Cf. also Paride Christoni, *La Seconda Fase del Pensiero Dantesco*, Livorno, Giusti, 1903, p. 206.

[1] *I Significati Reconditi, ecc.*, Livorno, Giusti, 1903, vol. I, p. 44.

[2] Flamini, *op. cit.* p. 50.

on the words of the poem, but only historical facts needed for the comprehension of what follows. Similarly *Convivio* II, 2 is a chapter introductory to the commentary on the literal sense of the poem: it contains no comment on the words of the poem, but only the explanation of how the poem came to be written. At the end of the chapter the author makes the usual main divisions, and then, in the next chapter, begins the commentary on the words of the 'canzone' understood in their literal sense. These two chapters contain the 'antefatti,' the foundation of fact which underlies the versified drama: they should be clearly distinguished from the contents of the poem. It is obvious that both the literal and the allegorical senses must reside in the words of the 'canzone,' which, however, contains none of that introductory information that is in *Convivio* II, 2 and II, 13. Whatever is to be thought of the truthfulness or untruthfulness of the literal sense, these two chapters contain, to my mind, nothing but historical fact, and I cannot believe that the author ever suspected that any of his readers could harbour doubt as to the truth of either of them.

We have seen that *Voi che intendendo* appears to represent a second stage of the story begun in the *Vita Nuova*, and when in the commentary Dante tells us that the woman in question is 'quella gentil donna, di cui feci menzione nella fine della *Vita Nuova*,' we have no choice but to believe that the literal reality is an experience with a woman of flesh and blood. And the unsophisticated reader of Dante's own time would have no doubt as to that. The Florentine reader especially—who knew of Dante's relations with Beatrice, even apart from the *Vita Nuova*; who knew of his first brief inclination to the 'donna gentile,' and who perhaps knew (especially if the 'donna gentile' is 'Lisetta') of the poet's reconciliation to her—would find his own natural understanding of *Voi che intendendo* confirmed by the explanation of the author; and, finding the events securely indicated with a definite date attached, and with a direct reference to the *Vita Nuova*, the book which the author has said he intends to confirm, not disparage (*Convivio* I, 1), such a reader would not be troubled by any suspicion as to the truth of this literal account. And that, no doubt, is the mental attitude which Dante expected of him.

Let us, then, go back to our text (*Convivio* II, 2) content to accept what we are there told, as literally as it is given to us, and to leave the allegorical meaning of *Voi che intendendo* until we are informed about it.

The author says that in August 1293 the 'donna gentile' appeared to him for the first time accompanied by Love, as she had not formerly in 1291, and not only did she appear so to his eyes ('agli occhi miei'), but she also obtained some hold upon his...'mente' ('e prese alcun luogo nella mia mente').

The meaning of the word 'mente' is not always clear in the *Vita Nuova*. Often enough it seems to mean no more than 'memory,' and Melodia is of opinion that this is the meaning even in the much-discussed expression of *Vita Nuova*, § 2: 'donna della mia mente[1].' Renier, who examined the author's use of the word in detail, concluded that in that expression it referred to an intellectual love for Beatrice, 'un amore razionale[2],' and Flamini interprets: 'signora dei miei pensieri[3].' In the *Vita Nuova* the word does seem to have a sense similar to the English 'mind,' which may mean 'memory' (as in the expression 'call to mind'), or in general the 'intellect'; but in the years which elapsed between the composition of the *Vita Nuova* and that of the *Convivio* Dante had become far more versed in philosophy than he was when he wrote the former work, and, fortunately for us, there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the word 'mente' as it is used in the *Convivio*, for in the second chapter of the third book (part of the literal exposition of *Amor che nella mente*) our author explains and defines it at length. After distinguishing the three kinds of 'anima,' the 'vegetativa,' 'sensitiva' and 'intellettiva,' the last of which he afterwards refers to briefly as 'la ragione,' and after saying that this last-mentioned 'potenza' is, of all the 'bontadi della Natura,' the one which appears to be divine, he declares that by 'mente' is intended the sum of the faculties which are in this last 'potenza': 'E tutte queste nobilissime virtù, e l' altre che sono in quella eccellente potenza, si chiama insieme con questo vocabolo, del quale si volea sapere che fosse, cioè *Mente*.'

So, when Dante says that the 'donna gentile' 'prese alcun luogo nella mia mente,' he means that she obtained some hold upon that 'potenza intellettiva' which is the divine human reason. Needless to say this is more than she had done in the episode of the *Vita Nuova*, during which the 'anima' (which, in the *Vita Nuova*, is reason') surrendered nothing to her. Like the expression 'accompagnata d' Amore,' then, this second expression relates an important step beyond what was told us in the *Vita Nuova*, in the story of the 'donna gentile.'

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 9 f.
[2] Renier, *La Vita Nuova e la Fiammetta*, Torino, Roma, Loescher, 1879, pp. 108 f.
[3] *Le Opere Minori di D. A.* vol. I, p. 4, Livorno, Giusti, 1910.

After relating this new event, and dating it as occurring two years after the first appearance of the lady, described in the *Vita Nuova*, the poet continues with the evident intention of explaining the apparent contradiction between the account of the *Vita Nuova* (which ends with the rejection of the 'donna gentile') and the situation revealed in *Voi che intendendo*: that apparent contradiction which has caused so much trouble to his critics at all times: 'E siccom' è ragionato per me nello allegato libello, più da sua gentilezza che da mia elezione, venne ch' io ad essere suo consentissi; chè passionata di tanta misericordia si dimostrava sopra la mia vedova vita, che gli spiriti degli occhi miei a lei si fero massimamente amici. E così fatti, dentro me poi fêro tale, che 'l mio beneplacito fu contento a disposarsi a quella immagine.' This passage, as the opening words indicate, is a summary of the first part of the account in the *Vita Nuova*. It was the pitying expression of the lady which chiefly caused him to consent to be hers (*V. N.* § 38: 'E quando io avea consentito ciò, ...'). The eyes had first befriended her, and had succeeded in persuading his heart[1].

Now the words which come next in this chapter contain the continuation of the story, and lead us to the situation as set forth in the 'canzone' *Voi che intendendo*: it would have been better, I think, to present them with a new paragraph in the printed editions.

'Ma perocchè non subitamente nasce amore, e fassi grande e viene perfetto, ma vuole alcuno tempo e nutrimento di pensieri, massimamente là dove sono pensieri contrari che lo impediscono, convenne, prima che questo nuovo amore fosse perfetto, molta battaglia intra 'l pensiero del suo nutrimento e quello che gli era contrario, il quale per quella gloriosa Beatrice tenea ancora la rocca della mia mente.'

The new love was destined to become perfect. But it could not become perfect until it had received the full and final consent of the poet's reason. Before this end could be achieved much warfare ('molta battaglia') was necessary, as well as a reasonable time for reflexion and argument ('alcun tempo e nutrimento di pensieri'). In the *Vita Nuova* the poet's reason had remained quite unmoved, and the temptation to which his heart succumbed had only lasted a few days, and then had come repentance.

The new love did not become perfect until after the time when the 'canzone' *Voi che intendendo* was written: only in the later poem *Amor*

[1] Flamini, *op. cit.*, p. 131, interprets the words: 'dentro me poi fêro tale, ecc.,' as follows: 'tale mi ridussero interiormente, che mi piacque vagheggiare di continuo quell' imagine.'

che nella mente and in its commentary do we see that the final consent of reason has been obtained. But in the meantime much progress has been made. In *Voi che intendendo* the 'donna gentile,' who, in the *Vita Nuova*, had never obtained any hold upon the reason of the poet, has obtained 'alcun luogo nella...mente,' but 'la rocca della...mente,' that is the citadel of the reason, is still being held by Beatrice. This citadel of the reason is that final consent of the reason which was still withheld, as is explained in *Convivio* II, 7: 'Ma perocchè *ancora l' ultima sentenza della mente, lo consentimento cioè*, si tenea per questo pensiero che la memoria aiutava, ecc.' The 'rocca della mente,' the last stronghold of Beatrice, is now certain to fall, for the 'anima' in *Voi che intendendo* has lost courage: 'E ben si dee credere che l' anima mia conoscea la sua disposizione atta a ricevere l' atto di questa donna, e però ne temea' (*Convivio* II, 10), and the thought that is fighting for the new lady is capable not only of holding the 'alcun luogo nella...mente' which has already been captured, but is 'poderoso in prendere me, e in vincere *l' anima tutta*' (*Convivio* II, 8), including, that is, the 'rocca' which is still feebly defended. It is under the stress of this situation, when the new thought is about to complete its victory, when, that is, the final consent of reason is on the point of being reluctantly yielded, that the poet bursts into verse, compelled by his pent up emotions, and the 'canzone' *Voi che intendendo* is made: '...e quasi esclamando (per iscusare me della novità, nella quale parea a me avere manco di fortezza) dirizzai la voce mia in quella parte onde procedeva la vittoria del nuovo pensiero, che era vittoriosissimo, siccome virtù celestiale; e cominciai a dire: *Voi che intendendo il terzo Ciel movete.*'

After what has been said, it is, I think, superfluous to insist that the situation dated by Dante as belonging to August of 1293,—when the 'donna gentile' of the *Vita Nuova* appeared supported by Love, and captured a part of his 'mente' (that is of his reason, and so made imminent the fall of the 'rocca della...mente,' that is, made certain the granting of the final consent of reason)—is the same situation as that depicted in *Voi che intendendo*, and that the poet himself says that it is the same situation. Consequently the date August of 1293 is the date of *Voi che intendendo*[1].

J. E. Shaw.

Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

[1] Zingarelli (*loc. cit.*) also declares this to be the date of the poem. We thus have furnished for us not the least useful means for dating the composition of the *Vita Nuova*. We have seen that *Voi che intendendo* was certainly written after the 'libello' had been

finished. Accordingly the *Vita Nuova* was finished between June, 1291 (the anniversary of the death of Beatrice, mentioned in § 34) and August, 1293. In § 41 occurs the well-known reference to the ostentation of the 'Veronica' which happened, as Rajna has shown (*G. S. L. It.* VI, 113 f.), either at Epiphany or in Holy Week, or at the feast of the Ascension, with all the probability in favour of Holy Week. So the *Vita Nuova* must have been finished either soon after Epiphany or soon after Easter or soon after Ascension Day, of 1292 or 1293. But to suppose it were finished after Ascension or after Easter of 1293 would leave only three or four months for the poet's mental attitude to undergo the great change which showed itself in August of that year. Also it is reasonable to suppose with Barbi (*Bull. d. St. Dant. It.*, XI, p. 37) that the 'libello' was composed under the stimulus of a new enthusiasm for the memory of Beatrice, which coincides with the rejection of the 'donna gentile,' so that, begun already in 1291, it would be written and finished within not many months of that time. Hence the probabilities compel us to place the finishing of the work in 1292, or soon after Epiphany of 1293, with a strong preference in favour of placing it soon after Easter of 1292.

DANTE'S LETTER TO THE PRINCES AND PEOPLES OF ITALY (*EPIST. V*): CRITICAL TEXT.

The Latin text of this letter has been preserved in two MSS., both of the fourteenth century, viz. *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome, and *Cod. Vaticano-Palatino Latino* 1729 in the Vatican. Transcripts of these two texts were published by me in two previous articles in this *Review* (Vol. VII, pp. 32–9, 214–22). There exists also an early Italian translation of this letter, which, like that of the letter to the Emperor Henry VII, has been attributed to Marsilio Ficino, but is probably earlier.

The MSS. and printed editions referred to in the *apparatus criticus* which accompanies the subjoined critical text are indicated as follows:

For the Latin text (MSS.), Pant. = Cod. S. Pantaleo 8; Vat. = Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat. 1729; (printed editions), Tc. = Torricelli (1842)[1]; T. = Torri (1842)[2]; F. = Fraticelli (1857)[3]; G. = Giuliani (1882)[4]; O. = Oxford Dante (1904)[5]; P. = Passerini (1910)[6].

For the Italian text (printed editions), L. = Lazzari (1754)[7]; M. = Moutier (1823)[8].

For convenience of reference the numbering of the sections [in square brackets], and of the lines (in round brackets), of the text as printed in the Oxford Dante have been inserted in the critical text.

[1] In the *Antologia di Fossombrone*, 22 Oct. 1842 (see *M.L.R.* VII, 215, n. 1).
[2] *Epistole di Dante Alighieri edite e inedite*, Livorno, 1842 (*Epist.* v, pp. 28–32).
[3] *Opere Minori di Dante*, Firenze, 1857 (Ed. 1893, Vol. III, *Epist.* v, pp. 440–6).
[4] *Opere Latine di Dante*, Firenze, 1882 (Vol. II, *Epist.* v, pp. 12–16).
[5] *Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri*, Oxford, 1904 (*Epist.* v, pp. 405–7).
[6] *Le Opere Minori di Dante Alighieri*, Firenze, 1910 (*Epist.* v, pp. 28–42).
[7] In *Miscellaneorum ex MSS. libris Bibliothecae Collegii Romani Societatis Jesu tomus primus*, Romae, 1754 (pp. 139–44).
[8] In *La Cronica di Giovanni Villani*, Firenze, 1823 (Vol. VIII, pp. lvii–lxiii).

Epistola V.

Universis et singulis Italiae Regibus et Senatoribus almae Urbis, necnon Ducibus, Marchionibus, Comitibus[1], atque Populis, humilis Italus Dantes Alagherii[2] Florentinus et exul immeritus orat pacem[3].

[§ 1.] 'Ecce nunc[4] tempus acceptabile[5]' quo (2) signa surgunt consolationis et pacis. (3) Nam dies nova splendescit[6] ab ortu Auroram[7] demon-(4)-strans[8], quae iam tenebras diuturnae (5) calamitatis attenuat; iamque aurae orien-(6)-tales crebrescunt[9], rutilat coelum in labiis (7) suis, et auspicia gentium blanda serenitate (8) confortat. Et nos gaudium expectatum[10] (9) videbimus, qui[11] diu pernoctitavimus[12] in de-(10)-serto; quoniam[13] Titan exorietur pacificus, (11) et iustitia sine sole quasi heliotropium (12) hebetata[14], cum primum iubar ille vibra-(13)-verit[15], revirescet. Saturabuntur omnes (14) qui esuriunt[16] et sitiunt in lumine radio-(15)-rum eius, et confundentur qui diligunt (16) iniquitatem a facie coruscantis. Arrexit[17] (17) namque aures misericordes[18] leo fortis de (18) tribu Iuda; atque ululatum universalis (19) captivitatis miserans, Moysen alium sus-(20)-citavit, qui de gravaminibus Aegyptiorum (21) populum suum eripiet, ad terram lacte[19] ac (22) melle manantem perducens.

[§ 2.] (23) Laetare[20] iam nunc miseranda Italia (24) etiam Saracenis, quae[21] statim invidiosa (25) per orbem videberis, quia sponsus tuus, (26) mundi solatium et gloria plebis tuae, (27) clementissimus[22] Henricus[23], Divus et Au-(28)-gustus et Caesar, ad nuptias properat. (29) Exsicca[24] lacrymas, et moeroris vestigia (30) dele[25], pulcerrima; nam prope est qui (31) liberabit te de carcere impiorum, qui, (32)

[1] So Pant. F.G.O.P.; T. *necnon gentibus atque populis*; Vat. omits *Ducibus—Comitibus*; L.M. *a' duchi, marchesi* (M. *e m.*), *conti*.
[2] Pant. *Alegherij*; Vat. *Alagerij*.
[3] So Pant. T.F.G.O.; Vat. omits *-at pacem*; L.M. *prega pace*.
[4] So Pant. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Vat. omits *Ecce nunc*; L.M. *Ecco ora*.
[5] Pant. *accetabile*. [6] Vat. *spendescit*.
[7] So Pant.; Vat. reads *al* for *ab* and omits *ortu Auroram*; L.M. *mostrando da Oriente l' Aurora*; T.G. *alborem*; Tc. F.O.P. *albam*.
[8] Pant. Vat. *demostrans*. [9] Pant. *crebescunt*.
[10] Pant. *expetatum*. [11] So Vat.; Pant. *quod*.
[12] Pant. *pernotauimus*; Vat. *pernotitauimus*; L. *dimoriamo*; M. *dimorammo*; Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *pernoctavimus*.
[13] Tc. *quum*.
[14] So Pant. Vat. Tc. T.; L.M. *Senza luce al termine della retrogradazione impigrita*; F. *quasi ad h. h.*; G.O.P. *q. ut h. h.*
[15] So Pant. T.F.G.O.P.; Vat. *uibrauit*; Tc. *vibrarit*. [16] Pant. Vat. *exuriunt*.
[17] Pant. Vat. *Arrescit*. [18] So Vat.; Pant. *misericordis*; Tc. *misericordiae*.
[19] Tc. *melle et lacte*. [20] Pant. *Lectare*. [21] Tc. *quia*.
[22] Tc. *clemens*. [23] Pant. *hericus*. [24] Pant. *esicca*; Vat. *exica*.
[25] So Vat. Tc.; Pant. *dola*; L. *disfai*; M. *disfa'*.

percutiens malignantes, in ore gladii (33) perdet eos, et vineam suam aliis locabit (34) agricolis, qui fructum iustitiae reddant (35) in tempore messis.

[§ 3.] (36) Sed an non[1] miserebitur cuiquam ?[2] (37) Immo ignoscet omnibus misericordiam (38) implorantibus, cum sit Caesar, et maiestas (39) eius de fonte defluat pietatis. Huius (40) iudicium omnem severitatem abhorret, (41) et semper citra medium plectens, ultra (42) medium praemiando[3] se figit. Anne prop-(43)-terea nequam[4] hominum applaudet au-(44)-dacias[5], et initis[6] praesumptionum[7] pocula[8] (45) propinabit ? Absit, quoniam Augustus (46) est. Et si Augustus, nonne relapsorum (47) facinora vindicabit[9] ? et usque in Thessa-(48)-liam persequetur, Thessaliam, inquam, (49) finalis deletionis[10] ?

[§ 4.] (50) Pone, sanguis[11] Longobardorum, coad-(51)-ductam barbariem ; et si quid de Troia-(52)-norum Latinorumque semine superest, (53) illi cede, ne[12] cum sublimis aquila, fulguris (54) instar descendens, affuerit, abiectos videat (55) pullos eius, et prolis propriae locum (56) corvulis occupatum. Eia, facite, Scan-(57)-dinaviae soboles, ut cuius merito trepi-(58)-datis adventum, quod[13] ex vobis est, (59) praesentiam sitiatis[14]. Nec seducat alludens[15] (60) cupiditas, more Sirenum, nescio qua (61) dulcedine vigiliam rationis mortificans (62). ' Praeoccupetis[16] faciem eius in confessione (63) subiectionis, et in psalterio[17] poenitentiae (64) iubiletis[18] ' ; considerantes quia[19] ' potestati (65) resistens Dei ordinationi resistit ' ; et qui (66) divinae ordinationi repugnat, voluntati (67) omnipotentiae coaequali recalcitrat[20] ; et (68) ' durum est contra stimulum calcitrare[21].'

[1] So Pant. T.F.G.O.P. ; Vat. *Sed non an* ; Tc. *Sed an.*
[2] So Pant. Vat. F.G.O.P. ; Tc. *cuique* ; T. *Augustus* ; L.M. *d' alcuno.*
[3] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P. ; Pant. *preliando* ; L.M. *meritando.*
[4] So Pant. Vat. F.G.O.P. ; Tc. T. *nequiorum.*
[5] So Pant. Vat. ; Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *audaciis.*
[6] So Pant. Vat. ; L.M. *dolce e piano* (which points to a reading, or supposed reading, *mitis*, in mistake for *initis*) ; Tc. *initibus* ; T.F.O.P. *initiis* ; G. *rictibus.*
[7] So Pant. Vat. T.F.O.P. ; Tc. *praesumptorum* ; G. *praesumptiosorum* ; L. *beveraggi prosumptuosi* ; M. *b. per superstiziosi.*
[8] Pant. *procula.*
[9] Tc. *facinora non judicabit.*
[10] So T.F.G.O.P. ; Vat. *et u. in tesaliam p. tesalia i. f. delectionis* ; Pant. *et. u. in tessalliam in qua finalis dillectionis* ; L. *ed. insino in Tessaglia perseguirà Tessaglia, ma perseguiralla di finale dilezione* ; M. *e i. in T. perseguiterà, per T. seguirallo infinale dilezione* ; Tc. *usque in Thessaliam persequetur Thessalia igne finalis deletionis.*
[11] Vat. *sangu* (followed by hiatus).
[12] Vat. omits *ne.*
[13] So Pant. Vat. ; Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *quantum* ; L.M. *in quanto.*
[14] So Pant. F.O.P. ; Vat. *scitiatis* ; Tc. T.G. *sentiatis* ; L. *vogliate* ; M. *godiate.*
[15] So Pant. Vat. ; Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *illudens* ; L.M. *ingannatrice.*
[16] So Pant. T.F.G.O.P. ; Vat. *preocupatis* ; Tc. *praeoccupate* ; L.M. *occupate.*
[17] So Pant. (cf. Vulg. *in psalmis*) ; Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *et psalterio* ; L.M. *e nel saltero.*
[18] Tc. *jubilate.*
[19] So Pant. Vat. ; Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *quod.*
[20] Pant. *rechurerat.*
[21] Pant. *calcistrare.*

[§ 5.] (69) Vos autem qui lugetis oppressi[1], (70) 'animum sublevate, quoniam[2] prope est (71) vestra salus.' Assumite[3] rastrum bonae (72) humilitatis, atque glebis exustae animo-(73)-sitatis occatis, agellum sternite mentis (74) vestrae, ne forte coelestis imber, sementem (75) vestram ante iactum praeveniens, in (76) vacuum de altissimo cadat; non[4] resiliat[5] (77) gratia Dei ex vobis tamquam[6] ros quoti-(78)-dianus ex lapide; sed velut foecunda (79) vallis concipite[7], ac viride germinetis[8] (80) viride dico fructiferum[9] verae pacis; qua (81) quidem viriditate vestra terra vernante, (82) novus agricola Romanorum consilii sui (83) boves ad aratrum affectuosius et con-(84)-fidentius coniugabit. Parcite, parcite (85) jam ex nunc, o carissimi[10], qui mecum (86) iniuriam passi[11] estis, ut Hectoreus pastor (87) vos oves de ovili suo cognoscat; cui etsi (88) animadversio[12] temporalis divinitus est (89) indulta, tamen, ut eius bonitatem[13] re-(90)-doleat, a quo velut a puncto bifurcatur (91) Petri Caesarisque potestas, voluptuose (92) familiam suam corrigit, sed ei voluptuosius (93) miseretur[14].

[§ 6.] (94) Itaque, si culpa vetus non obest, (95) quae plerumque supinatur ut coluber (96) et vertitur[15] in se ipsam, huic[16] utrique (97) potestis advertere, pacem unicuique (98) praeparari[17], et insperatae[18] laetitiae iam primi-(99)-tias[19] degustare. Evigilate[20] igitur omnes, (100) et assurgite regi vestro, incolae Latiales[21], (101) non solum sibi ad imperium, sed, ut (102) liberi, ad regimen[22] reservati.

[§ 7.] (103) Nec tantum[23] ut assurgatis exhortor, (104) sed ut illius

[1] Pant. *oppresi.* [2] Tc. *quia.* [3] Pant. *assummere*; Vat. *asummite.*
[4] So Pant. Vat. T.; Tc. *non enim*; F.G.O. *neve*; P. *ne.*
[5] So Pant. T.F.G.O.P.; Vat. Tc. *resiliet*; L.M. *torni indietro* (M. *addietro*).
[6] Pant. omits *tamquam.*
[7] So Pant. Vat. Tc. T.G.; F.O.P. *concipiatis*; L.M. *concepete.*
[8] So Pant. Vat. Tc. T.F.O.P.; G. *germinate*; L.M. *producete.*
[9] Tc. *fructiferorum.* [10] Pant. (apparently) *olrimi.* [11] Tc. *pasti.*
[12] Pant. *animauertio.* [13] Pant. *bonitate.*
[14] So Pant. P.; Vat. *uoluptuose famili miseretur*; Tc. *v. familiae miseretur*; T. *voluptuosae familiae libentius miseretur*; F.O. *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, libentius vero ejus miseretur*; G. *voluptuose familiae suae miseretur*; L.M. *desiderosamente la sua famiglia corregge, ma* (M. *ma a sè*) *più volonterosamente misericordia tribuisce.*
[15] So Pant.; Vat. *plerumque suppi et uertitur*; Tc. *p. supervenit et v.*; T.F.G.O.P. *p. serpentis modo torquetur et v.*; L.M. *spesse volte come serpente si storce, ed in sè medesima si travolge* (M. *si travaglie*).
[16] So Pant. Vat. T.; Tc. F.G.O.P. *hinc*; L.M. *quinci.*
[17] So Pant.; Vat. omits *praeparari* and leaves hiatus, as does Tc., which reads *uniuscujusque*; T. *unicuique gratissimam*; F.G.O.P. *u. esse paratam*; L.M. *a ciascuno essere apparecchiata* (M. *-ato*).
[18] Pant. *insperare* (for *-ate*); Vat. *erate*; T. *oratae*; Tc. F.G.O.P. *speratae*; L. *di disperata*; M. *di sperata.*
[19] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *priuitias*; L.M. *primizie.* [20] Pant. *Euigilare.*
[21] So Pant. P.; Vat. Tc. omit *incolae Latiales*, leaving hiatus; T.F.G.O. *incolae Italiae* L.M. *o abitatori d' Italia.*
[22] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *rengnum*; L.M. *reggimento.*
[23] So Vat. Tc. F.G.O.P.; Pant. T. *nec tamen*; L.M. *nè solamente.*

obstupescatis aspectum, qui[1] (105) bibitis fluenta eius, eiusque maria navi-(106)-gatis; qui calcatis arenas littorum et (107) Alpium summitates, quae sunt suae[2]; qui (108) publicis quibuscumque gaudetis, et res (109) privatas vinculo suae legis, non aliter, (110) possidetis[3]. Nolite[4], velut ignari, decipere (111) vosmetipsos, tamquam somniantes[5], in (112) cordibus et dicentes[6], 'Dominum non (113) habemus.' Hortus enim eius et lacus est (114) quod coelum circuit; nam[7] 'Dei est mare (115) et ipse fecit illud, et aridam fundaverunt (116) manus eius[8].' Unde[9] Deum Romanum[10] (117) principem praedestinasse relucet in miris (118) effectibus; et verbo Verbi confirmasse (119) posterius[11] profitetur ecclesia.

[§ 8.] (120) Nempe si 'a creatura mundi invisi-(121)-bilia Dei, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta[12] (122) conspiciuntur'; et si ex notioribus[13] nobis[14] (123) innotiora; simpliciter[15] interest[16] humanae (124) apprehensioni, ut[17] per motum coeli mo-(125)-torem intelligamus[18] et eius velle; facile (126) praedestinatio haec etiam[19] leviter intuenti-(127)-bus[20] innotescet[21]. Nam si a prima scintillula huius (128) ignis[22] revolvamus praeterita, ex quo (129) scilicet Argis[23] hospitalitas est[24] a Phrygibus de-(130)-rogata[25]; et usque ad Octaviani triumphos (131) mundi gesta

[1] So Tc. T.; G. *aspectu, vos, qui*; F.O.P. *aspectum. Qui*; L. *reverentia, voi che*; M. *reverenza. Voi che.*

[2] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *sue que sunt*; Parodi (*Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. XIX, 255) proposes to read *quae suae sunt.*

[3] Pant. *presidetis.*

[4] So Pant. Vat. Tc. T.G.; F.O.P. *possidetis*; *nolite*; L. *possedete. Non vogliate*; M. *possedete, non v.*

[5] Pant. *sopniantes.*

[6] Tc. *t. somniantes, in cordibus vestris dicentes*; T.F.G.O.P. *t. somniantes in cordibus, et dicentes*; L.M. *siccome sognando ne' vostri cori, e dicendo*; but cf. *Psalm* IV, 4: 'quae dicitis in cordibus vestris'; and XXXIV, 25; also X, 6, 11, 13; XIII, 1.

[7] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *num*; L.M. *or non è...?*

[8] Vat. *est* (by an obvious scribal error).

[9] So Vat. Tc. T.F.O.P.; Pant. *num*; G. *et*; L.M. *non riluce...?*

[10] Pant. omits *Romanum.*

[11] So Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. omits *posterius*; Vat. *propreerius*; L. *essere poscia confermato*; M. *essere posto e c.*

[12] So Vat. Tc. G.; Pant. *rellitta*; T.F.O.P. *intellectu* (but cf. *Rom.* I, 20; and *Mon.* II, 2, ll. 72–3).

[13] Pant. *nutioribus.*

[14] Tc. omits *nobis.*

[15] So Pant. Vat.; Tc. T.F.G.O.P. *similiter*; L.M. omit.

[16] So Vat. Tc. T.F.O.P.; Pant. *iter est*; G. *innotescunt*; L.M. *egli s' appartiene.*

[17] So Pant. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Vat. *ne*; L.M. *sicchè.*

[18] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *intelligimus*; L.M. *conosciamo.*

[19] Tc. *vel.*

[20] Pant. omits *intuentibus.*

[21] So Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. Vat. *innotescat*; L. *sieno chiare*; M. *fieno chiari.*

[22] So Pant.; Vat. *a prima huius ignis*; Tc. *a prima favilla hujus ignis*; T. *a prima hujus origine*; F.G.O.P. *a prima hujus ignis favilla*; L.M. *dalla prima favilla di questo fuoco.*

[23] Tc. *scilicet et Argis.*

[24] So Pant. Vat. Tc.; T.F.G.O.P. omit *est.*

[25] So T.; Pant. Tc. F.O.P. *denegata*; Vat. *deregata*; G. *defraudata*; L.M. *negata.*

revisere vacet[1]; nonnulla[2] (132) eorum videbimus humanae virtutis om-(133)-nino culmina transcendisse, et Deum per (134) homines, tamquam per[3] coelos novos, (135) aliquid operatum fuisse. Non etenim[4] (136) semper nos agimus; quin[5] interdum uten-(137)-silia Dei sumus; ac[6] voluntates humanae, (138) quibus inest ex natura libertas[7], etiam[8] (139) inferioris affectus immunes quandoque (140) aguntur, et obnoxiae voluntati aeternae, (141) saepe illi ancillantur ignare.

[§ 9.] (142) Et si haec, quae uti[9] principia sunt (143) ad probandum[10] quod quaeritur, non suffi-(144)-ciunt[11], quis non ab illata conclusione[12] (145) per talia praecedentia[13] mecum[14] opinari (146) cogetur, pace[15] videlicet[16] annorum duodecim[17] (147) orbem totaliter amplexata[18], quae[19] sui (148) syllogizantis[20] faciem[21] Dei filium[22], sicuti (149) opere patrato, ostendit[23]? Et Hic, quum (150) ad revelationem Spiritus, Homo factus, (151) evangelizaret in terris, quasi dirimens[24] duo (152) regna, Sibi et Caesari universa distribuens, (153) alterutri duxit[25] reddi quae sua sunt.

[§ 10.] (154) Quod[26] si pertinax animus[27] poscit (155) ulterius, nondum annuens veritati, verba (156) Christi examinet etiam[28] iam ligati; cui (157) quum potestatem suam Pilatus obiceret, (158) Lux nostra de sursum esse asseruit, quod (159) ille iactabat qui Caesaris ibi auctoritate (160) vicaria[29] gerebat officium. 'Non igitur (161) ambuletis, sicut et gentes ambulant in (162) vanitate sensus' tenebris obscurati; sed (163) aperite oculos mentis vestrae, ac videte (164) quoniam[30] regem nobis coeli et[31] terrae (165) Dominus ordinavit. Hic est quem Petrus, (166)

[1] Tc. *vacat.* [2] So Pant. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Vat. *nulla*; L.M. *molte cose.*
[3] Pant. omits *per.*
[4] So Pant. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Vat. *non eternj*; L.M. *E in verità non.*
[5] So Pant. Vat. F.G.O.P.; Tc. *quoniam*; T. *quia*; L.M. *anzi.* [6] Tc. *et.*
[7] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *liberata*; L.M. *la libertade.* [8] Tc. *ut.*
[9] Vat. *ubi.* [10] Pant. *adprobandum.* [11] T. *sufficient.*
[12] Tc. *ad illatam conclusionem.*
[13] So Pant. Vat. Tc. T.; F.G.O.P. *procedendo*; L.M. *innanzi passando.*
[14] So Pant.; Vat. Tc. *cum* (after hiatus); T. *ita mecum*; F.G.O.P. *nobiscum.*
[15] So Pant. Vat. T.; Tc. *in pace*; F.G.O.P. *pacem.*
[16] So Pant. Vat. Tc.; T. *vidimus*; F.G.O.P. *videns*; L.M. *cioè.*
[17] Pant. omits *duodecim.*
[18] So Pant. Vat. Tc. T.; F.G.O.P. *amplexatam.* [19] Tc. G. *qua.*
[20] So Pant.; Vat. *silogiza* (followed by hiatus); Tc.T.F.G.O.P. *syllogizatoris*; L.M. *sillogizzatore.*
[21] Tc. G. *facies.* [22] Tc. *filius*; G. *filii.*
[23] So Pant. F.O.P.; Vat. Tc. T.G. *ostenditur.* [24] Pant. *diruens.*
[25] So Vat. F.; Pant. *iussit*; Tc. T.G.O.P. *dixit*; L.M. *commandò.*
[26] Tc. *quare.* [27] Tc. G. *aliquis.* [28] Tc. *tum.*
[29] So Vat. Tc. T.F.G.O.P.; Pant. *a. uicarie*; L.M. *per vicaria autorità.*
[30] Tc. *videte: quoniam*; T.F.G.O.P. *videte; quoniam.*
[31] So Pant. Vat. Tc.; T.F.G.O.P. *ac.*

Dei vicarius, honorificare nos monet; (167) quem Clemens nunc Petri successor (168) luce Apostolicae benedictionis illuminat; (169) ut ubi radius spiritualis non sufficit, ibi (170) splendor minoris luminaris[1] illustret.

List of passages in which the present text (T.) differs from that of the third edition of the Oxford Dante (O^3.).

		O^3.	T.
Title		*Dantes Aligherius*	*Dantes Alagherii*
§ 1	ll. 3–4	*albam demonstrans*	*ab ortu Auroram demonstrans*
	l. 9	*pernoctavimus*	*pernoctitavimus*
	l. 11	*quasi ut heliotropium*	*quasi heliotropium*
§ 3	ll. 43–4	*applaudet audaciis*	*applaudet audacias*
	l. 44	*initiis praesumptionum*	*initis praesumptionum*
§ 4	l. 58	*quantum ex vobis est*	*quod ex vobis est*
	l. 59	*illudens cupiditas*	*alludens cupiditas*
	l. 63	*et psalterio*	*et in psalterio*
	l. 64	*considerantes quod*	*considerantes quia*
§ 5	l. 76	*neve resiliat*	*non resiliat*
	l. 79	*concipiatis*	*concipite*
	ll. 91–3	*voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, libentius vero eius miseretur*	*voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, sed ei voluptuosius miseretur*
§ 6	ll. 95–6	*plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur*	*plerumque supinatur ut coluber et vertitur*
	l. 96	*hinc utrique*	*huic utrique*
	ll. 97–9	*pacem unicuique esse paratam et speratae laetitiae*	*pacem unicuique praeparari, et insperatae laetitiae*
	l. 100	*incolae Italiae*	*incolae Latiales*
§ 7	l. 104	*aspectum. Qui*	*aspectum, qui*
	l. 110	*possidetis; nolite*	*possidetis. Nolite*
	ll. 111–12	*tamquam somniantes in cordibus, et dicentes*	*tamquam somniantes, in cordibus et dicentes*
§ 8	l. 121	*intellectu*	*intellecta*
	l. 123	*similiter interest*	*simpliciter interest*
	ll. 127–8	*a prima huius ignis favilla*	*a prima scintillula huius ignis*
	ll. 129–30	*Argis hospitalitas a Phrygibus denegata*	*Argis hospitalitas est a Phrygibus derogata*
§ 9	ll. 145–6	*per talia procedendo nobiscum*	*per talia praecedentia mecum*
	ll. 146–7	*pacem videns annorum duodecim orbem totaliter amplexatam*	*pace videlicet annorum duodecim orbem totaliter amplexata*
	l. 148	*syllogizatoris*	*syllogizantis*
	l. 153	*Alterutri, dixit, reddi*	*alterutri duxit reddi*
§ 10	ll. 163–4	*videte; quoniam*	*videte quoniam*
	l. 164	*coeli ac terrae*	*coeli et terrae*

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

[1] Tc. *luminis*.

THE DATE OF THE OLD ENGLISH INSCRIPTION ON THE BRUSSELS CROSS.

In my monograph, *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses* (Yale University Press, 1912), I commented upon the Brussels inscription which was brought to the attention of scholars in 1891 by Henri Logeman, in his brochure, *L'Inscription Anglo-Saxonne du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix,* and here reproduce a passage from that work (pp. 35–6):

'From *The Dream of the Rood* is taken a[n]...inscription occurring on a reliquary at Brussels, reputed to contain a fragment of the True Cross. The inscription was engraved on a strip of silver which formerly encircled the reliquary, and which was found when the latter was taken to pieces at the instance of Professor Logeman.... The Brussels inscription is not continuous on the silver plate of the reliquary, but divided as follows:

† RODISMINNAMAGEOICRICNECYNINGBÆRBYFIGYNDEB
LODEBESTEMED
ÞA
SRODEHETÆÞLMÆR
WYRICAN7
ADELWOLDHYSBEROÞO
CRISTETOLOFEFORÆLFRICESSAVLEHYRABEROÞOR

This gives us:

Rōd is mīn nama; gēo ic rīcne Cyning bær,
byfigynde, blōde bestēmed. Þās rōde hēt
Æþlmær wyrican, and Adelwold hys berōþo[r],
Crīste tō lofe, for Ælfrices sāule hyra berōþor;

which may be thus translated:

Rood is my name; of old I bore the mighty King, trembling, bedewed with blood. This rood had Æthelmær made, and Æthelwold his brother, to the glory of Christ, for the soul of Ælfric their brother....

Logeman assigns the Brussels inscription to about the year 1100, and this can hardly be far from the truth. In any case, I presume that no expert, in view of the phonology, would date it earlier than 1000. To the words cited as proof by Logeman might be added the Late West Saxon *gēo* and *wyrican*; the latter may be compared with the *wyricean* of the *Blickling Homilies*, commonly referred to A.D. 971, and the *wyrihta,-e* of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (ca. 950)....

On the back of the reliquary is the Old English sentence:

DRAHMALMEWORHTE;

which resolves itself into:

Drahmal mē worhte.

This, in modern English, means: "Drahmal made me."'

It will be observed that four names of men are here recorded—Æþlmær, Adelwold, Ælfric, and Drahmal—the first two standing for Æthelmær and Æthelwold. Moreover, three of these, Æthelmær, Æthelwold, and Ælfric, were brothers. Searle (*Onomasticon Anglo-saxonicum*) records thirty-five instances of the name of Æthelmær, most of them between 950 and 1050, and a much larger number of instances of Æthelweald (the normal form for Æthelwold) and Ælfric, many of which fall within the period just named. No doubt the same man is often designated under a variety of entries; thus, between 983 and 1005, the same Æthelmær is supposed to be represented by more than twenty different signatures (White, *Ælfric*, p. 69, note 1).

The date of the inscription could be more accurately fixed if we could discover in what period there fall three brothers bearing the names given above. The nearest approximation to such a trio that I have found occurs in Florence of Worcester under the date 1007, in a passage relating to Edric Streona. This runs (*Mon. Hist. Brit.*, p. 585): 'Cujus fratres extiterunt Brihtricus, Alfricus, Goda, Agelwinus, Agelwardus, Agelmerus pater Wulnothi patris West-Saxonum ducis Godwini.' Thorpe, in his edition (*Eng. Hist. Soc.*), reads Æ for A in Alfricus, Agelwinus, Agelwardus, and Agelmerus, and Wlnothi for Wulnothi. Searle (*op. cit.*, p. 5) notes that Ægel- is a late form for Æthel-; hence we are able to restore the Old English forms as Brihtric, Ælfric, Goda, Æthelwine, Æthelweard (-ward, -word), and Æthelmær. These, with Edric, were the seven sons of one Æthelric, a man of low birth. Edric became Earl of Mercia, and was slain by Cnut's command on Christmas Day, 1017; Brihtric is again mentioned by Florence

under 1008, as well as by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under 1009, and may possibly have been the father of Earl Godwine's first wife (*Dict. Nat. Biog.* 22. 50); Ælfric had a son, Edric the Wild, who was a powerful thane, mentioned by Florence under 1067, 1070, and 1072, and whom Searle conjectures to have been born about 1030; Æthelmær was the grandfather of Earl Godwine (Freeman, *Norm. Conq.*, Vol. 1, is doubtful about this), who became the father of Edith, wife of Edward the Confessor, and of Harold, the last of the Saxon kings (cf. Searle, *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings, and Nobles*, pp. 358–9). Of the other three, Goda, Æthelwine, and Æthelweard, the historians tell us nothing further. If, now, since the spelling Æthelward reposes upon a single occurrence of the name in a chronicler who lived about a hundred years later, we may suppose that this was miswritten for Æthelwald (and such misspellings of Old English proper names are by no means unheard of, as a glance through Searle's book will suffice to show), we shall have a sufficient clue to the identity of the persons mentioned in the reliquary. Æthelwold occurs side by side with Æthelwald in the texts: thus in 959 (Birch, *Cart. Sax.* 3. 270), 'Adeluuold dux'; and again, in the same year (3. 269), 'Aþelwold dux.' Similarly, Æthelword occurs for -weard, -ward, as, for example, in *Sax. Chron.* E, under 1017.

With this conjectural emendation, we should have the three brothers—Ælfric, Æthelwald (-wold), and Æthelmær—rising into power with their brother, Edric Streona, in 1007 (Freeman, *Norm. Conq.*, Vol. 1, chap. 5, § 4). Ælfric lived to have a son who accompanied William the Conqueror on that Scottish expedition in 1072 which led to the submission and homage of Malcolm, King of Scots (Florence), and therefore could himself hardly have died much, if any, before 1030. Æthelwold and Æthelmær, since they consecrated a cross to his memory, must have survived him. Hence the dedication of the cross may have occurred well on toward the middle of the century—a conclusion which tallies sufficiently with the opinion which I had expressed in my monograph.

Searle records only one name at all resembling Drahmal, and that is Dragmel, in the charter of 959 referred to above (Birch, 3. 271). The date is too early to accord with the other evidence, and the bearer of the name was a thane, not an artisan; but the occurrence of the name in the tenth century is not inconsistent with its appearance in the eleventh.

In so far as the assumed identity of the brothers reposes upon the emendation of Florence, it is of course doubtful; but the correspondence

of the names in the case of two of the brothers is striking, the date is reasonable, and the prominence of the individuals concerned accords well enough with the fact of the dedication.

If the cross was made in England, how then did it reach the Continent? Logeman mentions (p. 12) a belief that Egbert, Archbishop of Trier, who had been educated at the abbey of Egmond, in Holland, gave this cross to that monastery. He did, indeed, give a *golden* cross (p. 13)—which this reliquary is not; but, as he died in 993, his date is in any case too early to accord with my theory. However, his name suggests certain historical relations between England and the Low Countries in this part of the Middle Ages. Logeman is inclined to believe that Egbert was of English birth, and quotes a very doubtful chronicle to show that at all events he had English connections (pp. 15, 16). Van Zeeburgh (Nijhoff, *Bijdragen*, Ser. 2, Vol. 6, pp. 308–9), referring to the fact that Egbert was the son of Dirk II, Count of Holland, and Hildegard his wife, believes that Hildegard was the daughter of Baldwin II, Count of Flanders, and Ælfthryth his wife, daughter of King Alfred. If this is to be credited, it accounts for the fact that Egbert bears an English name (cf. Logeman, p. 16); for as Alfred was his great-grandfather, so King Egbert was grandfather of Alfred. Thus Archbishop Egbert would have sprung at once from the Counts of Holland, the Counts of Flanders[1], and the royal line of England. However that be, we know that the widow of King Alfred's father, Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, was married to Baldwin I of Flanders (A.D. 862), and we have just been reminded that Alfred's daughter married Baldwin II, the son of Judith, and by him had a son, Athulf or Adelolf, who, according to Stevenson (*Asser*, p. 308), must surely have been named after King Æthelwulf, Alfred's father. Baldwin II was buried in the abbey of St Bertin, from which Alfred had called Grimbald, the musician and scholar. From Baldwin II and Ælfthryth was descended Judith, daughter of Baldwin IV, who married (1) Tostig[2], Earl Godwine's son (1051), and (2) Welf, Duke of Bavaria. Judith's niece, Matilda, daughter of Baldwin V, was married to William the Conqueror, probably in 1053. The connection between the princely houses of Flanders and England was, then, such that a Flemish

[1] The relations between Holland and Flanders became closer in the latter half of the eleventh century, under Robert the Frisian, Count of Flanders.

[2] The mention of Tostig suggests the Kirkdale sundial, with its inscription 'in Tosti dagum eorl.'

countess, Judith, herself descended lineally from King Alfred, could be at the same time the sister-in-law of King Harold, who fell at Hastings, and aunt by marriage of William, his conqueror.

If Æthelmær, though of lowly birth, was indeed the great-grandfather of Harold and of Tostig, this fact may suggest how, with such relations between the Low Countries and England, the transmission of the cross to Flanders may have been effected.

ALBERT S. COOK.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

THE PARNASSUS PLAYS.

I. Text.

Students of the Elizabethan drama, above all students of academical drama, owe a debt of rare gratitude to the Rev. W. D. Macray, who first discovered *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and the earlier *Returne from Parnassus* in one of Hearne's miscellaneous volumes in the Bodleian, and then gave them to the world in 1886 in a charming edition which included an improved text of the well-known third play of the series, *The Returne from Pernassus or The Scourge of Simony*. No one is more conscious of this debt than I. Having however lately collated Mr Macray's text of the two earlier plays with the unique manuscript[1] on which it is based, I feel bound to point out the divergencies which I have found.

Before doing so, I must premise that I take no account of slight deviations from the MS. in the matter of spelling of words, such as the addition or omission of a final *e*, or such variations as 'constables' for 'cunstables,' 'squintinge' for 'sqintinge,' 'prettie' for 'prittie,' 'scarce' for 'scarse.'

Mr Macray stated in his preface: 'It may be well to mention that in the first two plays I have supplied the punctuation, the MS. itself being but scantily pointed.' He should perhaps have added that he had expanded contractions, not always on a consistent system, and that he had often made changes in the use of capital letters, both by way of addition and subtraction, and occasionally alterations in the division of lines.

I can now give the main results of my collation. My references are to Mr Macray's edition.

[1] Rawlinson D. 398.

'The Pilgrimage to Parnassus.'

p. 1, l. 9. For 'thoughte' read 'thoughts.'

p. 2, l. 26. For 'who lovs' read 'that lovs.'

p. 2, l. 43. For 'sonnete' read 'sonnets.'

p. 2, l. 44. For 'filde' read 'filds.'

p. 3, l. 62. With the form 'yonts' (=joints) we may compare l. 501 'yoyes' (=joyes). Probably both are solecisms of the scribe.

p. 4, l. 87. 'smother-dangled.' Mr Macray here and in many other such cases is responsible for the hyphen. In most cases the insertion carries conviction, but in some, and perhaps in this case, it is doubtful.

p. 4, l. 91. For 'entisemente' read 'entisements.'

p. 4, l. 98. 'That' is metrically superfluous, and perhaps is a scribal error due to the line above.

p. 4, ll. 99, 112, &c. The MS. has 'Pilgrimage' with a capital.

p. 4, l. 103. For 'But what? doe I prolong my studious speache' read 'But what doe I prolong my tedious speache.'

p. 5, l. 122. 'To drawe his slowe feete ore the clayie lande.' The MS. seems to have 'drowe' 'londe,' but perhaps these are scribal errors.

p. 5, l. 129. For 'whate' read 'whats.'

p. 6, l. 147. For 'O poeet Horace' read 'O sweet Horace.'

p. 6, l. 167. 'Anon, Anon, Sir.' Mr Macray, who has put these words into italics, might perhaps have included the words that follow 'Ey marye Sir!' as part of the tapster's speech.

p. 7, l. 199. For 'Lenten' read 'Lenton.'

p. 8, l. 215. For 'O the genius of xii^{d}! A quart will' &c. read 'O the genus of xii^{d} a quart will' &c.

p. 8, l. 216. For 'while' read 'whils.'

p. 8, l. 217. Mr Macray reproduces the MS. correctly in printing 'Dromeder': I think however that the scribe should have written 'Dromidot.' (See *M.L.R.* III, p. 142.)

p. 9, l. 270. For 'yonder' read 'yonde.'

p. 10, l. 281. For 'shadowles pale ghostes' read 'shadowes, and pale ghostes.'

p. 11, l. 333. For 'reprobate' read 'reprobates.'

p. 12, l. 349. For 'they' the MS. has 'the.' The substitution of 'the' or 'y^{e}' for 'they' and 'they' for 'the' is the scribe's most curious characteristic.

p. 12, l. 353. For 'by' read 'buye.'

p. 14, l. 406. 'Expect, the world, my poesie.' The commas inserted by the editor after 'expect' and 'world' are misleading.

p. 14, l. 428. For 'Eye!' read 'Eye,'. The word is merely the affirmative 'Ay,' and not a taking up of the word 'eye' in l. 425.

p. 15, ll. 444—453. This speech belongs to Amoretto, not Philomusus: as would be clear without the MS. ascription.

p. 15, l. 444. For 'wanton' read 'wantome.' Similar variation also in ll. 453, 463, 473, 496, 521, 542 and elsewhere. It seems clear that the 'm' in these cases is not a scribal error, but a dialectic peculiarity. The word perhaps followed the analogy of 'random,' 'venom,' 'vellum' &c.

p. 16, l. 486. 'surquerie' is clearly the scribe's error for 'surquedrie' (not 'suquerie,' 'sugarliness,' as Mr Macray imagined).

p. 18, l. 562. For 'Tartare' read 'Tarteret.'

p. 19, l. 572. For 'Tartarett' read 'Tarterett.'

p. 21, l. 641. The MS. has '(humanissimie auditores, and esse posse videatur).' The italics throughout are inserted by Mr Macray arbitrarily.

p. 21, l. 646. For 'spende' read 'mispende.'

p. 22, l. 691. For 'o' Mundaye' the MS. has 'a mundaye.'

p. 23, l. 699. For 'a pandar' the MS. has 'a Pandar.'

'The Returne from Parnassus.'

p. 25. The list of *dramatis personæ* in the MS., as here, includes 'Luxurioso.' It is probably a scribal error due to the name's following 'Studioso' and 'Ingenioso.' In the play itself, he is apparently always 'Luxurio.'

p. 26. Mr Macray here and elsewhere turns 'scæna' into the incorrect form 'Scoena.'

p. 26, l. 25. For ''haviour' read 'haviour.' (The MS. of course has 'u,' not 'v' in the middle of words.)

p. 27, l. 51. For 'gallons' the MS. has 'gallonts.'

p. 28, l. 99. For 'What! I leave' read 'What leave.'

p. 30, l. 161. For 'posted to everie poste' read 'pasted' &c.

p. 31, l. 188. 'Three blinde beggars' is italicised by Mr Macray, who also gives 'three' its capital, on the assumption that it is the title of a ballad. He states in his note that no such ballad is to be found in Chappell's collection: and possibly the phrase has no more relation to

the title of a ballad than 'the counterfeit criple' just above to the title of a play.

p. 35, stage direction. For 'Patron, reading.' The MS. has

'Patron.
He reades,' &c.

p. 35, l. 325. 'might it.' This is a silent emendation of the reading of the MS. 'might in.'

p. 35, l. 332, margin. For 'twoe' read 'twoo.'

p. 36, top. 'howsoever' introduces a clause, answered by the clause introduced by 'yet.' There should therefore be no comma after 'howsoever,' and only a comma, as in the MS., after 'countenance.'

p. 36, l. 365. The semicolon after 'smell' is wrongly inserted.

p. 37, stage direction. For *Luxurioso* read *Luxurio.*

p. 38, l. 416. For 'spente' the MS. (no doubt wrongly) has 'pente.'

p. 38, l. 420. For 'sacket' read 'sukket.'

p. 39, l. 443. For 'we'ele' the MS. has 'weele.'

p. 40, l. 469. For 'no hops' read 'no hope.'

p. 40, ll. 475—6. For 'beare, eare' the MS. has 'beares, eares,' which are clearly wrong.

p. 41, l. 503. For 'alwayes bene' read 'bene alwaies.'

p. 41, l. 514. For 'willinge' the editor should perhaps have retained 'willninge.'

p. 41, l. 515. For 'note' read 'rule.'

p. 42, l. 546. For 'balderkine of...ale' read 'kilderkin' &c.

p. 43, l. 579. For 'drancke' read 'druncke.'

p. 44, l. 601. For 'barke' (though it might seem to lead up to the following lines) the MS. has 'backe'—perhaps wrongly.

p. 44, l. 605. After this line the two following are found in the MS.:

'what idler thinge than speake and not be harde?
yet harde it is to smarte, and not to speake.'

p. 44, l. 610. For 'heard' read 'hard.'

p. 44, l. 617. For 'yealded' read 'yelded.'

p. 45, l. 631. For 'beautous' read 'beutuous.'

p. 46, l. 666. For 'some caste out of his...wardropp' read 'some caste sutes of,' &c.

p. 46, l. 683. 'Well, Philo,' &c. The MS. has 'Well Phil:' In such cases Mr Macray generally and rightly prints the full name. This applies also to l. 689.

p. 47, l. 710. For 'in stocks' read 'in the stocks.'

p. 48, l. 756. After this line add *Exit.*

p. 51, l. 819. For 'wee'll make a good markitt' read 'weele... markett.'

p. 51, l. 827. '(happie...els!).' In the MS. the bracket is not terminated. The sense would be best given if a dash were substituted for the sign of the bracket before 'happie.'

p. 52, l. 560. The bracket indicating an aside here and at ll. 1003, 1009, 1015, 1130, 1396 is not found in the MS.

p. 52, l. 875. It is better to keep the punctuation of the MS.:— 'I care not for fame, but valoure, and' &c.

p. 52, l. 879. For 'gettinge...throughe everie by-streete' read 'jettinge' &c.

p. 53, l. 885. For 'is peasande' read 'is a peasande.'

p. 53, l. 892. For 'commande quick rapier' read 'commande a quick' &c.

p. 53, l. 899. For 'Etas' read 'Ætas.'

p. 54, l. 923. For 'hearde' read 'harde.'

p. 56, l. 982. 'One weaver fellow.' The MS. has 'Weaver.'

p. 56, l. 985. For 'vertues; however, I merit his praise' read 'vertues, howsoever I merit his praise:'.

p. 57, l. 1011. 'Pardon mee, moy mittressa, ast am a gentleman.' The MS. has no comma after 'mee.' The scribe probably had before him 'Pardonnez moy, mistresse, as I am' &c.

p. 57, l. 1031. For 'scholasticall invitation' read 'scholasticall imitation.'

p. 58, l. 1050. For 'i' faith' the MS. has 'y faith.'

p. 59, l. 1071. For ''havioure' read 'havioure.'

p. 59, l. 1072. 'nutreringe.' The word shows signs of attempted correction. The natural form is 'nurteringe.'

p. 59, ll. 1093—5. Better to close the sentence at 'destinie,' and turn the full-stop after 'skill' into a comma. There is no stop at either place in the MS.

p. 60, l. 1109. 'in those ackhorns times,' clearly the age in which savages fed on acorns. We may dismiss the editor's conjecture 'Acheron's.'

p. 60, l. 1127. For '20 angells' read 'some 20 angells.'

p. 61, ll. 1144—5. 'illupola mangia.' This is all in one word in the MS. The couplet here given in a corrupt form is

Chi pecore si fa
Il lupo lo mangia

(noted in the Bodleian copy, apparently by the late Mr E. W. B. Nicholson). Mr Macray's note gives a half-French equivalent.

p. 61, l. 1161. The scribe has written the word 'weightie' so that the initial letter looks like 'n.' This confirms my emendation of Shakespeare's *Sonnet LI* (*Modern Lang. Review*, IX, p. 372).

p. 62, l. 1170. 'Red ressen hem.' So the MS. 'Redressen hem' is clearly required, and 'agains' or 'against' should be inserted after it.

p. 64, l. 1235. 'this bracchidochio.' Mr Macray should not have deprived 'Bracchidochio' (or Braggadochio) of his capital, either here or at l. 1445. To the Elizabethan he was a character of the *Faerie Queene*.

p. 64, l. 1246. 'and yonder he is.' The stage-direction at this point '*Enter Philo.*' has been omitted.

p. 64, l. 1247. For 'my plage jades' read 'my pluge [=plough] jades.'

p. 64, l. 1248. For ''pearde 'fore' the MS. has 'pearde fore.'

p. 64, l. 1249. For 'The parish' read 'the parish.'

p. 64, l. 1254. For 'thou mightest' read 'thou might.'

p. 64, l. 1256. For 'hadle up' perhaps 'handle up.'

p. 65, l. 1275. For 'good haps' (also in the MS.), we should perhaps read 'good hopes,' unless l. 1287 is considered to confirm the text.

p. 66, l. 1317. For 'stuttringe' read 'stuttinge.'

p. 67, l. 1343. For 'sp'rits' the MS. has 'sprits' or 'sprites' (according as you expand the contraction).

p. 69, l. 1391. 'mercuriall...martiall.' Both with capital M in the MS.

p. 70, l. 1438. For 'Why saide shee that' read 'Why saide she than.'

p. 71, l. 1463. Mr Macray needlessly inserts '[I].'

p. 71, l. 1484. For 'tedious talks' the MS. has apparently 'tedious talls,' a scribe's error for 'tales' presumably.

p. 72, l. 1499. After this add *Exit.*

p. 72, l. 1506. For 'voacall' read 'vocall.'

p. 72, l. 1518. Read 'as true a Homer as ever *μηνιν αειδε θεα*' [no accents].

p. 72, l. 1521. For 'as litell reckoninge' read 'as litell a reckoninge.'

p. 73, l. 1526. For 'birthe. Howsoever' &c. read 'birthe, howsoever' &c.

p. 74, l. 1580. For 'While' read 'Whils.'

II. Authorship and Allusions.

Lines 76—79 of the Prologue to *II Returne* run as follows:

> In Scholers fortunes twise forlorne and dead
> Twise hath our weary pen earst laboured.
> Making them Pilgrims [to] Pernassus hill,
> Then penning their returne with ruder quill.

The last words seem to me to imply (1) that *I Returne* was not written by the author of the *Pilgrimage*, (2) that *II Returne* was written by the author of *I Returne*. The former conclusion seems to be confirmed by the passage in the Prologue to *I Returne* about the author of the *Pilgrimage*, which seems more likely to have been written by someone else than by himself. Moreover, if he could no longer laugh at a play, was he likely to have written one?

Probably therefore two authors are in question[1], (1) the author of the *Pilgrimage*, (2) the author of the two *Returnes*.

About the second we know nothing, except that like the first he was probably a Johnian.

About (1) there are various statements in *I Returne* Prologue. The first play had 'made our poet a staide man.' Taking this in connexion with what follows, I have no doubt the word 'staide' contains a pun. It had caused him to be 'stayed' from his degree. But it is implied that this 'stay' was only temporary. It 'had like to have made him senior sophister' i.e. to have left him still a sophister when the other men of his year had got their degrees. But it had not done so. He had in spite of the 'stay' got his degree that year. But how? We are told

> He was faine to take his course by Germanie
> Ere he coulde gett a silie poore degree.

This is commonly understood literally. He obtained a German degree. But this is inconsistent with what has been said. If he had not obtained a Cambridge degree, he would still have been senior sophister. And the explanation implies that a Cambridge man, leaving the University without a degree and under a cloud, could go to a German University and obtain a degree within a few months. We need some evidence of the possibility of this. I have little doubt that the words have some double sense. The poet had recourse to some powerful friend who overcame the impediment put in his way, just as the Master of Pembroke Hall overcame the impediment put in Gabriel Harvey's

[1] Line 47 of the Prologue to *II Returne* might be taken as evidence to the contrary, but I do not think it is decisive.

way when other members of his College refused him the Grace for his M.A. degree. Now it is noticeable that on 3 April 1598 William Holland (who had been admitted fellow on 10 April 1584) became Senior Fellow of St John's and remained so apparently till 1605. He was appointed Principal Lecturer 7 July 1599.

If the poet had recourse to the intervention of Holland, who may have been his tutor, would not that be a natural explanation of the words of the Prologue 'he was faine to take his course by Germanie'?

The next lines of the Prologue are a famous *crux*:

> Hee never since durst name a peece of cheese,
> Thoughe Chessire seems to priviledge his name.

It is noticeable that the author of the Pilgrimage *had* named 'a peece of cheese.' In Act v Dromo instructs the clown: 'Why, if thou canst but drawe thy mouth awrye, laye thy legg over thy staffe, sawe a peece of cheese asunder with thy dagger, lape up drinke on the earth, I warrant thee theile laughe mightilie.' These words to us seem harmless: but it is possible that they contained ridicule of some fellow of the College, and gave offence.

As to the line 'Thoughe Chessire seems to priviledge his name,' Mr C. W. Previté-Orton has offered an ingenious explanation[1]. He takes the words to mean that the poet was not merely a Cheshire man, but held some Cheshire scholarship or fellowship at St John's. But only one Cheshire name, he says, appears on the College Registers at this date, namely that of William Dodd [matriculated as sizar of Pembroke Hall about 1597], scholar of St John's Nov. 1597, B.A. 159$\frac{8}{9}$, fellow 26 March 1602, M.A. 1602. William Dodd obtained his B.A. degree within a month or two of the performance of the *Pilgrimage*: there seems therefore to be nothing against his authorship, while the fact that he became a fellow would imply that he was a student of more than ordinary ability.

It is worth remarking that a few lines after the reference to the 'peece of cheese,' the Clown reads a love-letter of his own, which begins: 'O my lovely Nigra, pittie the paine of my liver! That litell gallowes Cupid hath latelie prickt mee in the breech with his great pin, and almost kilde mee thy woodcocke with his birdbolte.' 'Woodcock' in the sense 'dolt' is of course common enough. It is noticeable however that Randulf Woodcocke (also a Cheshire man) was admitted a fellow of St John's on 6 April 1593 and was almost certainly still a fellow in 159$\frac{8}{9}$. Possibly then he was the person who took offence.

[1] *Cambridge Review*, Feb. 9, 1910.

As Mr Macray notes, on the outside leaf of the manuscript of the *Pilgrimage* and *I Returne* is written, as the owner's name, 'Edmunde Rishton, Lancastrensis.' Of this man Mr Macray had obtained no information. Edmund Rishton was however matriculated as a sizar of St John's about 1595, became B.A. 159$\frac{8}{9}$ (i.e. in the same year as Dodd) and M.A. 1602. He was probably therefore one of the actors in the *Pilgrimage* and *I Returne*. The fact that his MS. does not contain the *II Returne*, coupled with the other fact that he took his M.A. (and presumably left Cambridge) in 1602, may be taken to support the theory that the *II Returne* (as has been argued on other grounds) was not acted till Christmas 160$\frac{2}{3}$.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

THE FIRST QUARTO 'HAMLET.'

The *Hamlet* quarto of 1603 evidently means one thing to us if it contains discoverable elements of an earlier version of the play, and quite another if it is merely a distortion of the completed drama filled out and revised by an inferior poet. So far, the arguments on this important matter have been almost wholly subjective and conjectural. Both sides are fully represented by the late Dr Furness in the Appendix on 'The Date and the Text' in his Variorum *Hamlet*, vol. II; there has been nothing written since which throws any new light on the problem.

I need not repeat these arguments. Knight is the chief of those who have contended that we have in the First Quarto a corrupt copy of the play as Shakespeare wrote it in the first period of his dramatic work, and he makes an elaborate contrast of this original sketch with the completed drama, to illustrate Shakespeare's development in verse and diction, in dramatic skill, and in his insight into the deeper meanings of life. He notes that all the essential action of the play is present in this first writing of it; that the character of Hamlet is fully conceived, as is that of Polonius (in this First Quarto called Corambis); but that in the amended play possible suggestions of Hamlet's actual madness are modified, and the contemplative side of his nature is elaborated, while there are significant changes—all indicating the wisdom and the skill of the dramatist in his maturity—in the arrangement of the scenes and in various other matters. There is one short scene, between Horatio and the Queen, which does not exist at all in the revision.

The arguments of Knight in favour of this view, which Dr Furness is fully warranted in calling 'shrewd and forcible,' are sustained and strengthened by Delius, Elze, Dyce, and others. The great difficulty with it is that there is nothing in Q_1 which is at all in Shakespeare's earlier manner. The lines which correspond to those in the 'true and perfect copy' which was published the following year (Q_2) are far

beyond Shakespeare's reach in his first period, and those which do not correspond are just as far beneath him at any stage in his career. But to say this is to combat an opinion with another opinion; and the names of Knight, Delius, Elze, Staunton, and Dyce are not to be tossed aside with an arbitrary comment.

Collier suggested that the play as it stands may have been taken down in shorthand and omitted portions of it filled in by an inferior writer. Tycho Mommsen first proposed (1857) to substitute an actor writing (very illegibly) from memory, whose notes were filled out by a bad poet. Grant White, while arguing for Q_1 as a mutilated copy of the acted *Hamlet*, finds traces of an older play in the scene between the Queen and Horatio, omitted later, and in the names Corambis for Polonius and Montano for Reynaldo. As these were traces of the earlier drama, says White, they were eliminated when the 'true and perfect copy' was sent to the press. The Cambridge Editors at first contented themselves with the theory of short-hand notes partly supplemented by a reference to the authentic copy, some inferior servant or actor being employed to make the comparison by stealth. Later, in their edition in the Clarendon Press series, they ventured upon what Dr Furness calls the most satisfactory hypothesis yet proposed. It is this: 'That there was an old play on the story of *Hamlet*, some portions of which are still preserved in Q_1; that about the year 1602 Shakespeare took this and began to remodel it for the stage, as he had done with other plays; that Q_1 represents the Play after it had been retouched by him to a certain extent, but before his alterations were complete; and that in Q_2 we have for the first time the *Hamlet* of Shakespeare....In the earlier form it appears to us that Shakespeare's modifications of the Play had not gone much beyond the Second Act.'

But how should we account for the publication of the text in this peculiar form? Is it conceivable that Shakespeare at the height of his power should have consented to the production of a play while it contained elements which were simply ludicrous in their crudity? Or was his private manuscript stolen before he had done with it? If Q_1 represents the state of a play at any stage of its revision by Shakespeare, we may learn from it that the world's master-dramatist worked by an utterly unthinkable process;—that he would alternate some speeches of the sublimest poetry with others which contain all his ideas and are essential to the progress of the scene, but which are composed in a verse which is sometimes as 'ragged' and 'jagged' as Skelton's, and at other times as regular and monotonous as Gower's.

A most interesting combination of all three of these elements may be found in Hamlet's most famous soliloquy:—certain perfect lines which no one but Shakespeare could have written; some which contain the thought in the form of doggerel; and some which express Shakespeare's very sentiments in a verse that is wooden and mechanical.

> To be, or not to be, I there's the point,
> To Die, to sleepe, is that all? I all:
> No, to sleepe, to dreame, I mary there it goes,
> For in that dreame of death, when wee awake,
> And borne before an euerlasting Iudge,
> From whence no passenger euer retur'nd,
> The vndiscouered country, at whose sight
> The happy smile, and the accursed damn'd.
> But for this, the ioyfull hope of this,
> Whol'd beare the scornes and flattery of the world,
> Scorned by the right rich, the rich cursed of the poore?
> The widow being oppressed, the orphan wrong'd,
> The taste of hunger, or a tirants raigne,
> And thousand more calamities besides,
> To grunte and sweate vnder this weary life,
> When that he may his full *Quietus* make,
> With a bare bodkin, who would this indure,
> But for a hope of something after death?
> Which pusles the braine, and doth confound the sence,
> Which makes vs rather beare those euilles we haue,
> Than flie to others that we know not of.
> I that, O this conscience makes cowardes of vs all,
> Lady in thy orizons, be all my sinnes remembred.

That the older play, which is found by some critics in Q_1, was the *Hamlet* now generally attributed to Kyd is confidently asserted by Professor Boas[1], who finds 'that the last three Acts are almost entirely pre-Shakespearean, and that the Stratford dramatist found the *scenario* of Hamlet fully sketched out for him by an earlier playwright.' To prove this he restates the usual arguments from the general nature of the play, and adds a list of parallel passages in the *Spanish Tragedy* and the Q_1 *Hamlet* (some of which occur in the 'revised' *Hamlet* as well). But if he proves anything, Professor Boas proves too much with his array of parallels, for some of them are so close that Kyd himself could scarcely have used the lines in two distinct plays. We are supposed to have learned at last that identity of phrase in two dramas does not mean identity of authorship. On the whole, the verse of Q_1 differs as radically from Kyd's as it does from that of the early Shakespeare; and the occasional parallels which are not included in the authentic *Hamlet* could as easily be due to the imitative hack poet

[1] *The Works of Kyd*, pp. xlvi—lvii.

mentioned by Collier and Mommsen, as to the existence of these phrases in an earlier *Hamlet* of Kyd. It was in 1602, as we know from Henslowe, that the Pseudo-Jonson additions to the *Spanish Tragedy*[1] were giving to that play a new lease of life.

Of these various theories, some take account of some of the peculiarities of the Q_1 *Hamlet* and others explain other features; but no one has given a full and satisfying explanation of them all. We must set aside as unbelievable the idea that the complex character of Hamlet as we find it even in the First Quarto was conceived by Shakespeare before he realized the shadowy lords and ladies of *Love's Labour's Lost*, or that Kyd or any other man than Shakespeare at his greatest created this baffling and fascinating prince. We cannot believe that Shakespeare revised a play by any such method as that proposed by Clark and Wright; we cannot think that while writing some of his most wonderful lines he would continue on the same elevation of thought with lines which are ridiculously unscannable, or proceed through the major portion of three acts in a verse that is mechanical and wooden. Nor can we believe that the crude verse or the mechanical verse was that upon which Shakespeare built, for the ideas throughout it all are the ideas of a Shakespeare. On the other hand, the plays which were taken down in short-hand and surreptitiously published bear no similarity to this distorted *Hamlet*; though better in some places than others, they maintain a fairly even character throughout, as we should naturally expect.

But the First Quarto *Hamlet* furnishes us with a clue which I believe has been hitherto overlooked. A careful comparison of it with the true Shakespearean text will reveal the fact that the pirated quarto was based upon a very corrupt version of the acted play supplied to the publisher by the player who acted the part of Marcellus. With this mere suggestion, I might safely leave the proof to anyone's comparison of the texts and his inevitable deductions from it; but this is my 'hinseck,' and, like the father of Joseph Vance, I insist upon the right to 'crock' it myself.

Marcellus is the only character in the play whose lines are given with approximate accuracy throughout, and the scenes in which he

[1] We have a choice between believing that the additions we have are not those for which Henslowe paid Jonson, and the belief that Jonson transacted the business, but Webster or some other wrote the passages. Webster was at this time about twenty-two years old, and was collaborating with seven others on four plays for Henslowe; he very probably could not have secured the task of improving the *Spanish Tragedy* from the ignorant and crafty manager. If Jonson wrote these additions, there is nothing to be said henceforth for 'internal evidence.'

appears are by far the closest to the authentic text. Even his involved and difficult speeches beginning

> Good, now sit downe, and tell me he that knowes

and

> It faded on the crowing of the Cocke,

are given with but one slight error. The often-noted fact that the first act is so much fuller and better than the rest is at once accounted for; as is the increased demand made in the later acts upon the hack poet, of whom I shall have more to say presently. 'Marcellus,' as I may call the actor for convenience, had certain discoverable characteristics which are worth our notice; it is in accord with his other qualities that he should have told the would-be publisher that he could quote or write out the play from start to finish; and every characteristic of Q_1 is explainable by his wretched attempt to do so, supplemented by the hack poet, whose services were soon found to be essential[1].

Before proceeding to examine the speeches of 'Marcellus' for certain hints which they may offer us, I wish to give one striking instance of the difference between the way he supplies his own lines and the way he reports those of Horatio immediately following:

> *Mar.* Good, now sit downe, and tell me he that knowes
> Why this same strikt and most obseruant watch,
> So nightly toyles the subiect of the land,
> And why such dayly cost of brazen Cannon
> And forraine marte, for implements of warre,
> Why such impresse of ship-writes, whose sore taske
> Does not diuide the sunday from the weeke:
> What might be toward that this sweaty march
> Doth make the night ioynt labourer with the day,
> Who is't that can informe me?
> *Hor.* Mary that can I, at least the whisper goes so,
> Our late King, who as you know was by Forten-
> Brasse of *Norway*,
> Thereto prickt on by a most emulous cause, dared to
> The Combate, in which our valiant *Hamlet*,
> For so this side of our knowne world esteemed him,
> Did slay this Fortenbrasse,
> Who by a seale compact well ratified, by law
> And heraldrie, did forfeit with his life all those
> His lands which he stoode seazed of by the conqueror....

[1] After rehearsing a drama to be given by amateurs, I have more than once heard some member of the cast say that he could give every line of the play. On one occasion I asked a young man who made this boast to begin a certain scene in which he did not appear. With a little prompting, he gave a considerable number of the lines exactly as they were, forgot a number of the speeches, and 'garbled' most of them. Allowing for the fact that he was not so ignorant as 'Marcellus,' he gave a fairly close representation of the 'Marcellus' nucleus of Q_1.

In the ten lines of Marcellus there is only one mistake—'march' for 'haste'; in the ten following lines of Horatio there are seven mistakes, apart from the division of the lines, which is only once correct. Only twice in his entire part does 'Marcellus' divide his own lines wrongly, for he had learned them from the copy and not by ear. One of these two mistakes is particularly interesting. He writes:

> Therefore I haue intreated him a long with us
> To watch the minutes of this night.

We may feel confident that this phrasing of it was drummed into him at rehearsal. It will be noticed that in giving Horatio's lines (and this is true very largely throughout) he follows a possible phrasing of the speaker when he does not divide for mere convenience. A more extended quotation would make this more apparent. A comparison of Horatio's lines just cited with Hamlet's soliloquy previously given (where, indeed, the services of the hack poet were required to fill out) will show how much better 'Marcellus' gives the lines of the others when he is himself in the scene; the omission of a line of Horatio's is the only serious blunder here; and the final speech of Horatio in this scene, when 'Marcellus' has no more difficult speeches of his own to be thinking about, is correctly given. There is no reason why he should not give many speeches in various parts of the play with substantial correctness, and he does. But in every part but his own there are many extreme and absurd blunders, while in his own part the mistakes are few and trifling. This difference demands an explanation; and the explanation is obvious[1].

[1] The mistakes which 'Marcellus' makes in his own part (that is, readings for which there is no warrant either in Q_2 or F_1) are the following:

I, i, 16. Omits the cue, 'Give you good night' (because repeated in line 18?), merging his two speeches into one.
25. 'twice seen by us' for 'twice seen of us.'
26. 'with us' belongs to the next line (as noted above).
40. 'Break off your talk, see' for 'Peace, break thee off, look.'
53. 'makes no answer' for 'will not answer.'
66. 'passed through' for 'gone by.'
77. 'march' for 'haste' (as noted above).
140. Omits 'Shall I strike at it with my partisan?'
142, 3. Writes ''Tis gone' with the next line, and inserts an 'O.' (It is the printer who divides 'majestical,' as the margin of the facsimile shows.)
145. 'invelmorable' for 'invulnerable.'
164. 'so gracious and so hallowed' for 'so hallowed and so gracious.'
I, ii, 213. A small bit of the dialogue is slightly transposed, but Marcellus answers his cue correctly.
227, 228. 'my good lord' for 'my lord.'
239. Inserts 'O.'
I, iv, 4. ''tis' for 'it is.'
80. 'My lord, be ruled, you shall not go' for '*Mar.* You shall not go, my lord' and '*Hor.* Be ruled, you shall not go.'

Certain qualifications of 'Marcellus' for reporting the play, or rather disqualifications ('For this effect defective comes by cause'), may be easily observed; and some of these bring us nearer than we have yet come to the inside history of a Shakespearean performance. 'Marcellus' had a way of thrusting in an extraneous 'O' here and there, and he and others may have spoken these 'O''s on the stage. When Horatio and the others leave Hamlet in I, ii, they say 'Our duties to your Honour,' and Hamlet replies 'Your loves, as mine to you.' So probably Shakespeare; but Q_1 gives it, 'O your loves, your loves, as mine to you,' and I suspect Burbage rather than 'Marcellus' of this emendation[1].

'Marcellus,' as we have seen, was a man of considerable ignorance; but his early entrance in the drama enabled him to furnish copy which at the start would be fairly acceptable, and this may have made the pirate publisher particularly prone to deal with him. He was a minor actor, apparently as dull as he was venal. Such mistakes as he makes in his own lines—'sweaty march' for 'sweaty haste,' 'invelmorable' for 'invulnerable'—bespeak his heavy stupidity. One may imagine how Shakespeare felt when such men spoke his lines. 'Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue; but if you mouth it, as many of your players do'—I continue from the text supplied by 'Marcellus'—

> I 'de rather heare a towne bull bellow,
> Then such a fellow speake my lines.

88,90,92. Transposes his two lines, 'Let 's follow; 'tis not fit thus to obey him' and 'Something is rotten in the State of Denmark,' and in consequence omits his final 'Nay, let 's follow him.'

[115. Furness mistakenly gives Hamlet's 'Ill, lo, lo, so, ho, so, Come boy, come' to Marcellus, in his reprint of Q_1, Variorum *Hamlet*, II, p. 51.]

143. '*Both.* What is 't, my lord?' for '*Hor.* What is 't, my lord? We will.' (He was probably told to join in.)

148. Omits 'We have sworn, my lord, already.' The reason is that he combines Hamlet's two speeches, 'Upon my sword' and 'Indeed, upon my sword, indeed' into 'Nay, upon my sword, indeed upon my sword,' upon which the Ghost cries 'Swear.'

There are two instances in which Q_1 gives a better reading in Marcellus's lines than Q_2 and F_1, and should be preferred to their combined authority. These cannot be numbered among the mistakes just cited:

I, i, 162. 'no planet strikes' rather than 'no planets strike.'

I, ii, 254. 'Our duties to your honor' rather than 'Our duty.'

Both of these have been frequently adopted. There are a number of instances where Q_1 strengthens the evidence of either Q_2 or F_1 against the other. It settles at least one disputed passage: it is Marcellus (as F_1 reads) and not Horatio (as Q_2 has it) who speaks the line 'What, has this thing appeared again to-night?'

[1] When Horatio says that he saw the King, Hamlet's father, yesternight, the Hamlet reported in Q_1 answers 'Ha, ha, the King my father ke you.' Compare in this connection *Romeo and Juliet*, IV, iii, last line. The First Quarto gives what I suppose was Shakespeare's original line, 'Romeo, I come; this do I drink to thee.' The inspired actor at the close of this tremendous soliloquy of Juliet at one time cried out in defiance of metre, 'Romeo, Romeo, Romeo, here's drink,—I drink to thee!' and the wise Shakespeare incorporated it forthwith. Such a line would have had its origin in such a manner.

This brings me to one final consideration. The 'Marcellus' theory, as I have endeavoured to state it, can be made to account for all the facts that we have, even including the relatively close approximation of much of Acts II and III to the authentic text. But inasmuch as the scenes in which the Players appear are those which contain most of the verbatim reporting, there is good reason for supposing that 'Marcellus' may also have sustained the part of one of the Players. We know how scanty a supply of men performed these mighty tragedies. The three-line Prologue and the six-line speech of Lucianus are correctly given; and though this of itself would prove nothing, so many of the lines in the 'Play within the play,' as well as so much of the surrounding dialogue, is true Shakespeare that I cannot avoid believing that our friend was there. Some omitted and not inferior lines show that this portion of our drama underwent revision; it is entirely possible that the 'Play within the play' as first given was almost exactly as we find it in Q_1. Its success with the audience would account for its elaboration.

That there were some changes afterwards made in the text as 'Marcellus' knew it, appears to me certain from this scene; but these were apparently such changes as occur constantly in acted plays even by the most skilful and successful dramatists[1]. I can give no reason for the changing of the names Corambis and Montano to Polonius and Reynaldo[2], but this change is another proof that the play as 'Marcellus' knew it was revised. There are no indications, however, of any far-reaching revision.

After the final exit of the Players, the exact correspondences of Q_1 to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* are occasional and brief. 'Marcellus' seems to have remembered well anything at all indecent, or any lines bound together with easy and obvious rime. This would account not only for his success with the 'Play within the play,' but for the fulness and accuracy with which he gives the songs of the mad Ophelia. But except for such instances as these, he is able to furnish less and less

[1] In like manner, the First Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, so far as it represents the drama correctly, seems to me practically contemporaneous in composition with Q_2: for here again the imperfect copy contains some of the finest passages, and scenes which clearly show revision (for example, II, vi) do not offer a contrast of early and later work. For a suggestion as to what the changes may have been in the revision of this play, see the present writer's paper on 'Romeo, Rosaline, and Juliet' in *Modern Language Notes*, November, 1914.

[2] Collier remarks, 'Ben Jonson changed the whole *dramatis personae* of his *Every Man in His Humour*'; but as the names in this play are in general descriptive of the characters, there was some point in the alteration. Grant White's suggestion that Shakespeare's change of these names was due to a desire to erase all traces of the older drama will scarcely do, in view of the fact that the name of Hamlet himself is not altered.

as the play progresses. The short scene between Horatio and the Queen—which never took place—only illustrates how far he finally came from giving the dialogue of the acted drama. All that is contained in this scene, which is wholly in the style of the hack poet, is brought out elsewhere in the play—except that here, as in the Closet Scene, the Queen's character and attitude are reformed. Her scene with Horatio was merely a ready expedient for dramatizing 'Marcellus's' notes and fragments.

But does this determine the question as to whether the wooden verse of Q_1 was written in order to fill out the fragmentary manuscript submitted by 'Marcellus,' or was taken from the older *Hamlet*? We know that the older play existed, and it would have been cheaper for the publisher to have copied from it—if he had it. But it would have been all but impossible to cull from an older drama passages which would lend themselves so conveniently to fill out or to incorporate the fragments of 'Marcellus.' We are fairly safe in conjecturing that the *Ur-Hamlet* was Kyd's, and we can be reasonably sure that this verse was not Kyd's; in its percentage of double endings and other metrical characteristics, it does not resemble any verse of the period before 1589. And, as I have said, this verse contains many Shakespearean bits which are beyond the capability of a man who writes verse of this sort.

And yet the hack poet, whose services we must therefore recognize, was by no means without talent. He was a ready enough writer of blank verse; and one cannot fail to admire the ingenuity with which he incorporated the broken bits of Shakespeare which 'Marcellus' provided. It seems to have been his way, however, to leave untouched whatever was at all passable, though he could easily have straightened out or filled up the defective lines, and to rewrite only such portions as were obviously disconnected and incomplete. In Act I he wrote, apparently, not more than fifty lines; but after the disappearance of the Players we find him almost constantly at work. He may very possibly have been materially aided in his task by attending a performance of the play.

But I have had my fair share of deductions from this simple bit of observation. The result of it is simply that it is fairly demonstrable that the Quarto of 1603 was provided from the acting version of *Hamlet*, and contains no additional traces of an earlier play. We may know, then, that *Hamlet*, substantially as we have it, was an assured success on the stage before July 26, 1602, when James Roberts entered it on

the Stationers' Register 'as it was lately acted.' As the 'true and perfect copy' was not printed until 1604, it is the natural presumption that it was the promise of 'Marcellus' to supply the text that led Roberts to enter the play, and that it was the following year before the manuscript was put into shape by the hack poet. Even then, Roberts did well (if he was the printer) to publish it without his name[1].

HENRY DAVID GRAY.

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA.

[1] A friend suggests that if 'Marcellus' was as ignorant and stupid as I have made him out, he may have been discharged from his part, and taken his revenge in this manner in consequence. But it is not necessary to suppose this. Molière suffered a similar grievance at the hands of a member of his company.

SWIFT'S 'TALE OF A TUB[1].'

V.

The Authorship of the Notes (1704 and 1710).

When the volume containing *A Tale of a Tub*, etc. was first issued (1704) a certain number of explanatory notes appeared in the margin of the text, and they were reprinted in all subsequent editions. In the fifth edition (1710) there was added to these a new set of notes, printed at the foot of the page. In modern editions the two sets are printed together, and they are sometimes confused with the notes of later editors. Before dealing with the authorship of the notes it is therefore necessary to indicate their sources. In the following table I have given the origin of the notes to the *Tale of a Tub*, *The Battle of the Books* and *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, in every case where the editor of the Bohn edition has either omitted the reference altogether, or given it wrongly. Where the reference in Bohn is given correctly I have not repeated it.

(*a*) The following notes appeared in the margins of the first edition (1704):

pp. 41, 1 'Hor.' (the rest later), 2; 45, 1; 46, 1 'Vid. Xenoph.' (the rest added by the editor); 46, 3 'Hor.' (the rest added by the editor); 51, 1; 53, 3; 54, 2; 56, 1, 3 ('Viz. In the Year 1697') (see also under *c*); 58, 1, 2 (the first part, 'See Virgil Translated, etc.'); 65, 1 ('Quibusdam Veteribus Codicibus') (see also under *c*); 73, 1, 2; 74, 1, 2; 75, 1; 77, 1; 91, 1; 104, 1, 2; 106, 1; 109, 1; 117, 1; 121, 1; 122, 1; 128, 1; 129, 2 (the first line); 134, 1; 139, 1; 140, 1; 141, 3; 143, 2; 161, 1; 164, 1; 167, 1; 179, 2; 183, 1; 185, 1; 194, 1; 195, 1; 197, 1; 198, 1; 205, 1; 206, 1–4; 207, 1–3.

(*b*) At pp. 74 and 75 the notes of the first edition 'Lib—' and 'Lib.' (referring to 'Nauplians' and 'Diodorus' respectively) are omitted

[1] See the *Modern Language Review*, Vol. VIII, pp. 301—13 and 454—63.

in the Bohn edition, and also on p. 178 the note 'Vid. Homer' (referring to 'spoiled' l. 20) and p. 186, 'Vid. Homer' (referring to 'as a woman': third line from bottom).

(*c*) The following, including those marked 'W. Wotton[1],' appeared for the first time as footnotes in the fifth edition (1710):

pp. 33, 1; 35, 1, 'Comptroller' (the rest added by Hawkesworth (1755)); 35, 2; 41, 1 ('something—before'); 47, 1; 48, 1 (the name 'Dryden' is added by the editor); 50, 2 (the editor omits 'Is' before 'The mountebank's'); 50, 3; 51, 2; 52, 1, 2; 53, 2; 55, 2; 56, 3 ('Viz. in the Year 1698') (see also under *a*); 56, 5; 57, 1, 2; 59, 1, 2; 60, 4, 5; 61, 1, 2; 63, 2; 65, 1 ('Some ancient manuscripts') (see also under *a*); 65, 2; 66, 1, 2 (the former part); 67, 1, 2, 3; 68, 1 (belongs to p. 66 and is an annotation on '"Brothers," said he'); 68, 2; 69, 3; 75, 2; 79, 1; 80, 2, 5; 81, 1, 3, 6; 82, 1, 2; 83, 1; 84, 1, 2, 3; 85, 1, 3; 87, 1, 3; 88, 1, 2, 3, 4; 89, 1, 2, 3; 90, 1, 2 (the former part); 92, 1, 2; 96, 1, 2; 97, 1; 101, 1–6; 106, 2; 107, 1, 2; 109, 2; 110, 1, 3; 111, 2; 113, 1; 114, 1; 115, 1 (the name 'Lewis XIV' is added by the editor); 115, 2; 118, 1; 122, 2; 124, 1; 125, 1; 127, 1; 128, 2, 3; 129, 1 (the former part); 129, 2 ('To the—road'); 130, 1; 131, 1; 132, 2 (the former part); 132, 3, 4, 5; 134, 2, 3, 4; 135, 1, 3, 5; 136, 1, 2; 139, 3; 140, 2; 141, 1, 2; 143, 1 ('This—Ryswick'); 165, 2; 173, 5; 178, 3 (Sir John Denham's—'Cooper's Hill'); 181, 4; 182, 1; 184, 2; 186, 4; 191, 1 (the latter part).

(*d*) At p. 40 a note in the fifth edition on 'the School of Poetry' has been omitted. It runs thus:

This I think the Author should have omitted, it being of the very same Nature with the School of Hobby-Horses, *if one may venture to censure one who is so severe a Censurer of others, perhaps with too little distinction.*

(*e*) The following appeared for the first time in Hawkesworth's edition (1755):

pp. 16, 3; 19, 1; 22, 1; 28, 1; 35, 1 ('The kingdom—hand'); 38, 2; 58, 2 ('He—patrons'); 126, 1 (the first line); 143, 1 ('which was—1697'); 171, 1 ('Bentley—Æsop,' the rest by Scott); 177, 1; 178, 4 (Mr Wesley—etc.); 191, 1 (the former part).

(*f*) The attribution of a note to Bentley at p. 59, 3 is copied from Scott. I have not been able to discover whence Scott obtained the notes so marked. Bentley certainly never published any notes on Swift. The first reference to him in this connection that I have found is in the

[1] The name 'Wotton' was added to the notes taken from Wotton's *Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning...With Observations upon The Tale of a Tub* (1705). In the editor's note at p. 21 of the Bohn edition the word 'third' should be 'fifth.'

Miscellaneous Works of 1720 (see Section II of this paper). In the 'Advertisement' the bookseller professes to transcribe 'a part of a Letter sent' him...'from an ingenious Gentleman of' his 'acquaintance.' The 'ingenious gentleman' writes 'I think it's almost needless to tell the Readers, they ought not to impute to the Author the sense given to his words in these Notes....I once hoped to have found a great many more curious Notes of this kind, in the Remarks made on this Book by *D. Bentley* the Author's principal Hero. I am told this is a Masterpiece of modern Criticism....'

The first set of notes (those marked (*a*) and (*b*) in this list) form, for the most part, a very simple commentary on the text. They explain parts of the allegory, and give a few references for quotations and allusions. Only two notes either are, or affect to be, the work of another hand. They are:

p. 58: 1] The title-page in the original was so torn, that it was not possible to recover several titles, which the author here speaks of.

p. 201: in the text]. Here the whole scheme of spiritual mechanism was deduced and explained, with an appearance of great reading and observation; but it was thought neither safe nor convenient to print it.

Who wrote these two? Swift appears to have left the *Tale* to its fate until 1710, when we find him in correspondence with Benjamin Tooke about a new edition. This new edition (the fifth) contained all the previous notes, including the two we are considering. If he had disapproved of them, Swift could easily have suppressed them: but he let them stand. Therefore, he either wrote them himself, or he accepted responsibility for them. For our purposes the one thing is as good as the other.

The second set of notes (those marked (*c*) and (*d*) in the above list) are of a different character. They make a fairly elaborate comment on the text and in some cases they express opinions on it. (See, for example, 33, 1; the note printed in (*d*), above; 52, 1 and 2; 53, 2; 55, 2; 57, 1; 59, 1 An error...Lambin; 66, 1; 92, 1; 118. 1; 124, 1; 140, 2; 181, 5; 191, 1 This...relation.)

Two letters survive from the correspondence between Swift and Tooke (*The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. F. Elrington Ball, vol. I, pp. 183–186). A passage at the beginning of the second letter (Tooke to Swift: July 10, 1710) settles the responsibility for the second set of notes.

Enclosed I have sent the Key, and think it would be much more proper to add the notes at the bottom of the respective pages they refer to, than printing them at the end by themselves.

Dr Elrington Ball comments on this:

> From a passage lower down[1] it is evident that Tooke was of opinion that the Key, or Analytical Table, as it was called eventually, should be divided and appear in the form of footnotes.

A glance at the Analytical Table will show that it is altogether unsuitable for use as a series of footnotes. It is merely an analysis. To print for example, at the foot of p. 16 a note 'An irony runs through the whole book' as a commentary on the passage '...there generally runs an irony through the thread of the whole book' would be a wasteful and ridiculous excess. Dr Elrington Ball appears to have been misled by one of the modern reprints of the *Tale* and supposes that the Analytical Table was printed in the fifth edition (1710). (See note 4, p. 183, *op. cit.*) But it did not appear until the edition (probably spurious) included in the *Miscellaneous Works* of 1720. What then is the 'Key' to which Tooke refers? It can only be the second set of notes. Tooke had his way and they were printed at the foot of the page, where we find them in the fifth edition. As the copy had been sent to Swift, and he did not stop the publication, Swift either wrote these footnotes himself or he accepted responsibility for them. For our purposes the distinction is immaterial.

A passage at the end of the *Apology* is to be noticed:

> The author is informed, that the bookseller has prevailed on several gentlemen to write some explanatory notes; for the goodness of which he is not to answer, having never seen any of them, nor intends it, till they appear in print....

The *Apology* is dated 'July 3, 1709.' Tooke sent the Key to Swift on July 10, 1710. But Swift preferred not to lose such protection as a pretended ignorance could give him, and did not alter what he had written.

It should be remarked that the Key (as Tooke calls it) has no connection with the *Complete Key* published by Curll, and referred to in the following Section.

[1] The following is the passage referred to: 'What I beg of you at present is, that you would return the Apology and this Key, with directions as to the placing it: although I am entirely of opinion to put it at the bottom of each page; yet shall submit.'

VI.

Thomas Swift.

The volume containing *A Tale of a Tub*, etc., was issued anonymously in 1704, and at first there was much speculation about the author. Some said Sir William Temple had written it; some ascribed it to Smalridge; Atterbury reported that at Oxford it was generally supposed to be the work of Rag Smith and John Phillips; later he seems to have suspected Swift[1]. From the beginning there were some who attributed the work, or a large part of it, to Thomas Swift.

(*a*) In 1705 Wotton wrote in the *Defence of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*:

> The World besides will think it odd, that a Man should in a Dedication play upon that Great Man, to whom he is more obliged than to any other Man now living; for it was at *Sir William Temple*'s Request, that my Lord *Sommers*, then Lord-Keeper of the Great-Seal of *England*, gave Mr *Swift* a very good Benefice....It is publicly reported that he wrote this Book...*in my own Conscience* I acquit him from composing it. The Author, I believe, is dead, and it is probable that it was writ in the year 1697, when it is said to have been written (pp. 539–40). Cf. also p. 519.

The 'Mr Swift' to whom Wotton refers is Thomas Swift, the 'little parson cousin,' with whom Jonathan was corresponding in 1692–3 (see Swift's *Correspondence u.s.* pp. 361–8), and whom Somers presented to the Rectory of Puttenham in Surrey[2].

'The Author' whom Wotton believes to be dead is, I suppose, Sir William Temple[3].

(*b*) We next hear of Thomas Swift in this connection in the *Complete Key to the Tale of a Tub* printed in 1710 by Edmund Curll. The passage in question is as follows:

> *The Occasion of Writing it.*
>
> A Preface of the *Bookseller* to the *Reader* before *the Battle of the Books* shews the Cause and Design of the whole Work, which was perform'd by [4]a couple of young Clergymen in the Year 1697. who having been Domestick Chaplains to Sir *William Temple*, thought themselves oblig'd to take up his Quarrel in Relation to the Controversy then in Dispute between him and Mr. *Wotton*, concerning *Ancient* and *Modern* Learning.

[1] Atterbury's ignorance is particularly interesting because it disposes of the story repeated from one writer to another that Swift's *Battle of the Books* was circulated in MS. as a reply to Wotton and Bentley. If anyone had seen such a MS. it would have been Atterbury. As the *Battle* appeared in the same volume with the *Tale*, he must have recognised it if he had seen it before. He was, in fact, as much in the dark as everybody else. (See Beeching's *Atterbury*, p. 233.)

[2] Wotton believed him to be Jonathan Swift's brother (p. 486, *op. cit.*).

[3] Deane Swift, writing in 1755 in *An Essay upon the Life...of Dr Jonathan Swift* (p. 60), said that the *Tale* was revised by Sir William Temple.

[4] Generally (and not without sufficient Reason) said to be Dr. *Jonathan* and *Thomas Swift*.... [This and the next two notes are from the *Complete Key*.]

The [1] one of 'em began a *Defence* of Sir *William* under the Title of *A Tale of a Tub*, under which he intended to couch the General History of Christianity; shewing the Rise of all the Remarkable Errors of the *Roman Church* in the same order they enter'd, and how the Reformation endeavour'd to root 'em out again, with the different Temper of *Luther* from *Calvin* (and those more violent spirits) in the way of his Reforming: His aim is to Ridicule the stubborn Errors of the *Romish Church*, and the Humours of the *Fanatick Party*, and to shew that their Superstition has somewhat very fantastical in it, which is common to both of 'em, notwithstanding the Abhorrence they seem to have for one another.

The Author intended to have it very regular, and withal so particular, that he thought not to pass by the Rise of any one single Error or its Reformation: He design'd at last to shew the Purity of the Christian Church in the primitive Times, and consequently how weakly Mr. *Wotton* pass'd his Judgment, and how partially in preferring the *Modern* Divinity before the *Ancient*, with the Confutation of whose Book he intended to conclude. But when he had not yet gone half way, his [2] Companion borrowing the *Manuscript* to peruse, carried it with him to *Ireland*, and having kept it seven Years, at last publish'd it imperfect;...However he added to it the *Battle of the Books*...and having added a jocose Epistle Dedicatory to my Lord *Somers*, and another to Prince *Posterity*, with a pleasant Preface, and interlarded with one *Digression* concerning *Criticks*, and another in the *Modern* kind, a *Third* in Praise of *Digressions*, and a Fourth in Praise of *Madness* (with which he was not acquainted [3]) concludes the Book with a *Fragment* which the first Author made, and intended should have come in about the middle of the *Tale*, as a Preliminary to *Jack*'s character...*Thomas Swift* is grandson to Sir *William D'avenant*, *Jonathan Swift* is Cousin German to *Thomas Swift* both retainers to Sir *William Temple*.

On the first page of a copy of the *Complete Key* preserved in the British Museum there is written in Edmund Curll's own handwriting [4]:

Given me by Ralph Noden, Esq: of the Middle Temple. E. Curll.

Ralph Noden was admitted to the Middle Temple on March 7, 1701. He had previously been admitted to the Inner Temple on July 13, 1687. There does not seem to be any other information about him.

(*c*) On June 29, 1710, Jonathan Swift wrote to Benjamin Tooke (when arrangements were being made for the 5th edition of the *Tale*):

I have just now your last, with the Complete Key. I believe it is so perfect a Grub-street piece, it will be forgotten in a week. But it is strange there can be no satisfaction against a bookseller for publishing names in so bold a manner. I wish some lawyer could advise you how I might have satisfaction; for at this rate, there is no book, however vile, which may not be fastened on me.

I cannot but think that little parson cousin of mine is at the bottom of this: for, having lent him a copy of some part of, etc. and he showing it, after I was gone for Ireland, and the thing abroad, he affected to talk suspiciously, as if he had some share in it. If he should happen to be in town, and you light on him, I think you ought to tell him gravely, that, if he be the author, he should set his name to the, etc. and rally him a little upon it; and tell him, if he can explain some things, you will, if he pleases, set his name to the next edition. I should be glad to see how far the foolish impudence of a dunce could go.

[1] *Thomas Swift.* [2] Dr. *Jonathan Swift.*

[3] Corrected to 'unacquainted' in the Errata at the end of the pamphlet.

[4] Compare the footnote at p. vi of the Advertisement in Vol. II of Nichols' edition of Swift (1801) (cited under (*d*) below).

In a Postscript to the 'Apology' in the fifth edition Swift said:

> Since the writing of this, which was about a year ago, a prostitute bookseller [i.e. Curll] has published a foolish paper, under the name of Notes on the *Tale of a Tub* with some account of the author: and, with an insolence which, I suppose, is punishable by law, hath presumed to assign certain names. It will be enough for the author to assure the world, that the writer of that paper is utterly wrong in all his conjectures upon that affair. The author farther asserts, that the whole work is entirely of one hand, which every reader of judgment will easily discover. The gentleman who gave the copy to the bookseller, being a friend of the author, and using no other liberties beside that of expunging certain passages, where now the chasms appear under the name of *desiderata*. But, if any person will prove his claim to three lines in the whole book, let him step forth, and tell his name and titles; upon which, the bookseller shall have orders to prefix them to the next edition, and the claimant shall from henceforward be acknowledged the undisputed author.

(*d*) In Nichols' edition of Swift's *Works* (1801), vol. II, there is prefixed to the *Tale of a Tub* an 'Advertisement,' which includes an account of its origin 'communicated to Mr Nichols in 1777 by the Rev. Samuel Salter, D.D., then Master of the Charter-house.'

One paragraph of this is as follows:

> In March 1766, a copy of the first edition of the Tale of a Tub was sold (for 5*s.* 6*d.* only) at an auction of books, by S. Baker: this copy had, it seems, belonged to Sheffield duke of Bucks....In the first blank leaf the duke (as is believed and there affirmed) had written these words: 'What follows here written, is all by the hand of Mr Thomas Swift': or something of this tenour. In the next page T. S. has given the following anecdotes:
>
> 'The preface of the Bookseller...both retainers to Sir W. Temple.' [The passage is identical with that printed above from the *Complete Key*.]

(*e*) Lastly in *Notes and Queries* (Fifth Ser. VIII, Aug. 4, 1877: p. 100), appeared the following paragraph:

> Last week at Sotheby and Co's a copy of Swift's *Tale of a Tub* was sold, which was said to have belonged to Lady Betty Germain, who has noted in it that it was written by *Jonathan and Thomas Swift*, and that she had got Thomas to write on the margins what each wrote. It confirms the dean's assertion that he did not write the *Tale of a Tub*, but only the *Digressions*. In this copy 'Jon. Swift' is written against the *Preface* and the *Digressions*, but Thomas's [sic] against each chapter of *The Tale*.

I have been unable to trace any such copy. The British Museum copy of Sotheby's catalogue for Thursday, July 19, 1877, mentions that a copy of the first edition of the *Tale* was bought by Nattali for £7. 7*s.* 0*d.*, but says nothing about MS. notes, and this is the nearest to the description in *Notes and Queries* that can be found. The various statements afford a pretty example of the growth of a legend. We progress from guesses to signed documents, and the story is baseless from beginning to end.

A. C. GUTHKELCH.

LONDON.

NOTES ON 'CLEANNESS' AND 'SIR GAWAYNE.'

The following notes are offered on some passages in *Cleanness* and *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight.*

(1) *Cleanness,* 1413 ff.

> & ay þe nakeryn noyse, notes of pipes,
> Tymbres & tabornes, tulket among,
> Symbales & sonetez, sware þe noyse,
> & bougounz busch batered so þikke.

What does *bougounz* mean? The *N.E.D.* says: '? some kind of musical instrument'; Stratmann-Bradley has: 'an instrument of music.' These renderings are, of course, purely contextual, and, I think, inaccurate. Professor E. Weekley seems to have put students on the right track, in his article on 'Anglo-Romance Etymologies' in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1907–10; pt ii. pp. 205 ff.) s.v. *Bludgeon,* which he suggests may be < O.F. *boug(e)on, boujon,* etc.: he concludes: 'the M.E. *bougounz,* only recorded once, may quite well be a beating instrument.' Following this hint, I suggest that it means here, 'drum-sticks.'

The most frequent meaning of O.F. *bougon* is 'a heavy cross-bow bolt with a large head, intended for smashing rather than piercing.' (Cf. O.F. *garrot* and *materas,* with the same meaning, also used in the sense of 'cudgel.') Various other meanings of *bougon* are given in the Dictionaries, many denoting some instrument with a rounded, swollen, extremity, or one with such a rounded swelling in some part of its length. Diez derives *boujon,* therefore, < *bŭlla, boule*[1]. We may perhaps compare O.E. *cycgel* = 'cudgel,' which Kluge connects with N.H.G. *kugel* = 'ball' and *keule* = 'club' (presumably with a knob or rounded, swollen, end), and Skeat with SWED. *kugge* = 'cog' and DAN. dial. *kug(e)l, kygl,* = 'rounded,' 'convex.'

[1] Cf. Godefroy, and Littré, s.v. *Boujon*; La Curne de Ste. Palaye, s.v. *Bougon*; and Hatzfeld-Darmesteter, s.v. *Bouge*; II: 'Marteau à bouges, dont la panne est légèrement arrondie, pour creuser en frappant.'

It seems that *busch* is here a substantive (not recorded in this sense in the *N.E.D.*) cf. *bush* vb < O.F. *buschier* = 'frapper,' 'heurter' (esp. at a door, from the instances given by Godefroy). The verb *bateren* (originally echoic?) is peculiarly appropriate to the noise of (kettle-)drums: cf. *N.E.D.* s.v., from Gerrard's *Art of Warre* (1591), 204: 'The drums ought to be ready to batter their caisses': and ib. 118 'stroke or batterie of drums.'

I would, therefore, translate l. 1416 thus: 'and drumsticks' noise (striking, strokes) clattered (rattled) so thick (fast).'

(2) *Sir Gawayne*, 151 ff.

> Ande al grayþed in grene þis gome & his wedes,
> A strayt cote ful stre3t, þat stek on his sides,
> A mere mantil abof; mensked with-inne,
> With pelure pured apert þe pane ful clene,
> With blyþe blaunner ful bry3t, & his hod boþe,
> Þat watz la3t fro his lokkez, and layde on his schulderes;
> Heme-wel haled hose of þat same grene,
> Þat spenet on his sparlyr, and clene spures vnder,
> Of bry3t golde, vpon silk bordes, barred ful ryche,
> & scholes vnder schankes, þere þe schalk rides:
> & alle his vesture verayly watz clene verdure....

The crux of this difficult passage is the word *scholes*. Morris suggested: 'hangs down' (?), *or*, perhaps, an error for *schoes*; on this Skeat comments: '*Scholes*...can hardly be a verb, nor do we wear shoes under our shanks.' He suggests that the word means the side-flaps of the saddle, or whatever then occupied that position. 'I suppose that, when the horse was armed as well as the man, there were thin plates in such a position, with a cloth between the plate and the horse's back. Something there must have been to keep the leg-armour from galling the horse. I therefore take *schole* to be the equivalent of the mod. Sw. *skolla* = "lamina, thin plate (esp. of iron)": cf. G. (*eis-*)*scholle* = "flake of ice": (*erd-*)*scholle* = "clod of earth," or dialectally = "slice of cut turf," related to *shell* and *scale*: and *scholes* may be understood as meaning *scales* or even *flaps*: for the reference in the sense is to the shape, not to the material. Indeed, the Du. *schol* not only = "a flake of ice," "clod of earth," but also "a plaice," simply owing to its shape.' So far Skeat. To this I would add the following: The *scholes* are mentioned in the description of the Green Knight's own dress, and not in that of his horse's trappings, which does not begin till l. 164, and is not described in detail till 168: (ii) Though of course the saddle used may have been the same in peace or war, the mention of 'leg-armour,' etc., is irrelevant here, because we are expressly told that the

Green Knight is in weeds of peace (ll. 203–5 and 265 ff.); moreover, the 'saddle-flaps,' etc., were called *skirts* at this time (cf. 601).

I think that some leather or other protections, under and inside the thighs, 'where the man rides,' as in modern riding-breeches, are clearly intended. As regards the derivation of the word, I have nothing definite to offer, but it seems possible, from the material given by Björkman, *Scandinanian Loan-words in M.E.*, pp. 92, 93, and 121, that *schōle* may be a corrupt or analogical form < O.N. *skál* + *skal*.

(3) ll. 210 ff. (of the Green Knight's axe).

> Þe hede of an elnȝerde þe large lenkþe hade,
> Þe grayn al of grene stele & of golde hewen,
> Þe bit burnyst bryȝt, with a brod egge,
> As wel schapen to schere as scharp rasores;
> Þe stele of a stif staf þe sturne hit bi-grypte, etc.

What part of the axe is *þe grayn*? Morris left it unexplained: Stratmann-Bradley says 'socket?' The *N.E.D.*, s.v. *grain*, < O.N. *grein* = 'branch of a tree,' etc., quotes *Kyng Alisaunder* 6534: 'The horn [of a rhinoceros] is scharp as a sweord, | Bothe *by the greyn* & at ord'; and gives as the meaning (§ 4), 'blade of a weapon[1].' Mrs Wright[2] shews by quotations from the *E.D.D.* that the fundamental idea of the modern dialect meanings of the word is: 'a branch from a main stem[3].'

She continues: 'in *Alisaunder, the greyn* evidently means the thick end of the horn, where it branches out from the animal's head[4]. Thus I am inclined to think that the *grayn* in our passage is the thick part of the head of the axe, where it, as it were, branches off from the stem of the handle.' The *hede*, l. 210, would be the whole metal part, as distinguished from *stele*, 214. The *hede* is sub-divided into the *grayn* or 'thick end of the head, into which the handle is fixed,' and the *bit* or cutting part. (Cf. *E.D.D.* s.v. *Bit* sb.[2]) Surely this explanation is a mere elaboration of Stratmann-Bradley's 'socket.' Though the Dan. dial. *grēn* = 'twig, prong of a fork,' and N.E. dial. *grain* = 'prong of a fork,' shew that the *grain* may be thought of as a branch continued more or less in a straight line with the main stem or handle, yet the more frequent uses indicate a more pronounced angle with the main stem.

[1] In '*G.*' the *bit* (l. 212) is the blade or cutting part.
[2] *Englische Studien*, xxxvi. pp. 209 ff.
[3] Cf. Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan-words in M.E.* p. 43.
[4] *by the greyn* surely means along the whole length of the horn, along its edge, which is sharp, like the *ord* or point: the whole horn being considered as forming a *greyn* or branch, in relation to the head of the animal.

Why should not the *grayn* be the spike at the back, making a very real and obvious angle with or branch from the *stele*, and being also a much more noticeable part of the axe, and therefore more likely to occur in a special description? The axe in the illuminations in the MS., if I may judge from Madden's reproductions, has only small traces of such a spike, but several fourteenth century pictures of axes clearly shew one, so that its possibility is proved. What evidence have we from the names applied to this axe, and other mentions of axes as weapons? It is called a *giserne*[1], and a *denez ax*[2]. Schulz, *Das höfische Leben*, ii, pp. 179–80, thus summarises his discussion of the *Guisarme*:

> Die Guisarme ist ebenfalls eine Hiebwaffe. Sie mag der Sense oder der späteren Hellebarde etwa geglichen haben....*Demmin* identificirt die *Guisarme* mit der von ihm Gläfe genannten Waffe, die eine sensen- oder sichelartige Schneide mit Widerhaken besetzt an langer Stange zeigt. Ich glaube aber doch, dass eine Art langschaftiger Axt die Grundform dieser Waffengattung abgegeben hat. Dass sie eine Spitze hatte, wird uns ausdrücklich gesagt.

The *N.E.D.* says, s.v. *Danish axe*: 'a battle-axe with a very long blade [cf. *G.* 2224–5], and usually without a spike at the back.' But it is clear that our author identified *giserne* and *denez ax*, and whether he was strictly right in so doing, or not, the MS. illuminator followed him.

It seems quite permissible, then, to think of the Green Knight's axe as having a spike at the back which may be called the *grayn*[3].

(4) 1235–40:

> I schal ware my whyle wel, quyl hit lastez, with tale;
> ȝe ar welcum to my cors,
> Yowre awen won to wale,
> Me behouez of fyn force,
> Your seruaunt be & schale.
>
> (M-G. 1897 and 1912 text.)

The difficulty lies in l. 1240: how is *schale* to be taken?

Morris translated in the obvious common-sense way: 'It behoves me, of sheer necessity, to be your servant, (and) I shall (be).'

[1] ll. 288, 326, 375, 2265. [2] l. 2223.

[3] Cf. Volkmar Bach, *Angriffswaffen* etc., p. 45, s.v. *Guisarme*; a term vaguely used: O.F. Arthurian Romances usually speak of it as a cutting weapon (cf. *La Mule Sanz Frain*): the Epics usually make it a throwing weapon, while a few authors speak of it as a thrusting *or* casting weapon. Bach, however, thinks Schulz's idea is perhaps nearest the truth. Cf. Aron Sternberg, *Angriffswaffen* etc., pp. 40 ff.: he thinks the *guisarme* not a thrusting weapon, as Viollet-le-Duc does (v. 492), but a throwing (occasionally a cutting) weapon. Refer also to Godwin, *Archaeological Handbook*, p. 254, quoted in the Glossary to Skeat's *Havelok*, s.v. *Gisarme* (l. 2553): 'Distinguished from other weapons of the axe kind, by a spike rising from the back. There were two kinds, the *glaive-gisarme*, with a sabre-like blade and spike, and the *bill-gisarme*, like a hedging-bill with a spike.'

For illustrations of gisarmes, Danish axes, etc., cf. Hewitt's *Ancient Armour*, i, pp. 50–1; Schulz, *op. cit.* C. Ffoulkes, *Armour and Weapons* (1909) pl. xi; Viollet-le-Duc, *Dict. du Mobilier Français* v. 493; C. H. Ashdown, *British and Foreign Arms and Armour* (1909), pp. 321–2, etc.

Three objections have been made to this translation:

(i) That it makes the construction harsh and elliptical. (Luick in *Anglia* xi, p. 576.)

(ii) That the rhyme is then not good (id. *ib.*).

(iii) That we need a sb. parallel to *seruaunt.*

To these I would answer:

(i) The construction, if not exactly paralleled, can at least be illustrated by other harsh and elliptical uses of *shall*: e.g., *Sir Gawayne*, l. 1544:

> As I am, oþer euer schal, in erde þer I leue:

Chaucer *Troilus* and *Criseyde* (Globe ed.):

> i. 593 f.: I have, & shal, for trewe or fals report, | In wrong & right, y-loved thee al my live.
> *ib.* ii. 827: She seyde, 'O love, to whom I have & shal | Ben humble subgit,...'
> *ib.* ii. 46: For to thy purpos this may like thee, | And thee right nought, yit al is seyd or shal.
> *ib.* v. 615: And here I dwelle out-cast from alle joye, | And shal, til I may sen her eft in Troye.
> *ib.* v. 832–3: And oon the best enteeched creature | That is, or shal, whil that the world may dure.
> *ib.* v. 1317: Right fresshe flowr, whos I ben have & shal...

We must remember that conversation, especially in verse, necessarily differs somewhat in rigidity of construction from narrative; and when the exigencies of rhyme and alliteration are also taken into consideration, the present construction may certainly be allowed.

(ii) The question of rhyme presents more difficulty, and I hardly feel competent to deal with it, since it involves the vexed question of *-e* in the *Gawayne*-poet, and the metrical quarrels of so many German scholars. I shall nevertheless attempt some discussion. If the poet intended *tale*, etc., to be monosyllabic, then we have numerous parallels for the rhymes, and for the lengthening of *a* in *shal* < *sceal* before inorganic *-e*, e.g.:

> *Cursor Mundi*, 1251–2 (C):
> Toward þe est end of this dāle
> Find a grene gate þou sāle.
> (F has the same rhymes: T vāle : shāle; G dalle : sale.)
> *ib.* 10979–80 (C):
> Bi-for [al-mighti] Godd he sāle
> Bicum [a man of mikel] tale.
> (G has the same rhymes: F, shalle : alle; T, shall : al.)
> *ib.* 11889–90 (C):
> 'Aha! traiturs,' he said, 'i sāle
> Hing yow bot ye mak me hāle.'

(So F : G salle : hāle ; T alters the order of the words.)
ib. 12840–1 (C) : sāle : duāle (so G ; F sāle : bāle ; T, shāle, bāle).
ib. 13102–3 (C) : sāle : bāle (so all but T, shāle).
ib. 13890–1 (C) : sāle : hāle (so F ; G, salle : hāle ; T, shal : al).
ib. 14652–3 (C) : sāle : bāle (so F ; G, salle : bāle ; T, shalle : pralle).
ib. 18111–2 (C) : sāle : hāle (so G ; L, dōle : hōle ; so T).
ib. 19071–2 (C) : sāle : hāle (L, shalle : calle ; T, shal : cal ; G as C).
ib. 22969–70 (F) : sāle : hāle : 23561–2 (G) : sāle : tāle.
ib. 24476–7 (C) : sāle : bāle (so F and G) ; 28184–5 (C) : hāle : sāle.
Cf. Minot vii. 15–6 :

Vntill þe se his taile reche sāle,
All folk of France to mekill bāle.

(Here acc. to Hall, p. xv, sāle and bāle are monosyllabic : cf. vii. 109 ff., pall : call : (þai)sall : fall, rhyme together.

Though these are Northern examples, they may fairly be quoted in support of a *Gawayne* form, since our poem adopts so many Northern forms.

If on the other hand *tale*, etc. are dissyllables, as is probable, I see no reason why the inorganic *-e* of *schale* should not have been pronounced, *metri gratia*.

(iii) I do not see the necessity of having a parallel substantive, though one has been suggested of the same stem (?) or meaning as O.E. *scealc* > M.E. *schalk*, used in *Gawayne* and the *A.P.*

Luick (*l.c.*) suggested that *schale* is the infinitive of a verb equivalent in sense to 'seruaunt be,' and refers doubtfully to Halliwell's Dict. *s.v. Shale* = 'give way,' 'slide down.'

Two other German scholars have suggested that *schāle* < O.N. *skáli* = 'hut,' 'dwelling,' 'home.' They take *won* in 1238 as 'dwelling'; it is more usually taken as 'plenty,' 'possession' : however, their quotation from the *Cursor Mundi* may support their rendering of *won*[1] : *C.M.* 8591 (G) : 'For þai had housing nan to *wāle*, | þai dwelled in a littel *schāle*' : here C F have *scāle* (cf. *N.E.D.* s.v. *scale*, sb. 4, and T has *cote*. Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan-Words in M.E.*, pp. 93, 121, says that *schale* in *C.M.* 8591 is probably a mistake, but may perhaps be explained by the fact that some words < O.N. may have been Anglicised and pronounced with the *sh-* instead of the *sk-* sound ; though 'it is impossible to prove this in any single instance' (p. 291). We may observe, however, that the *E.D.D.* gives the following forms of *Shale* in this sense : *scale, shale, skell, skeal, sheal, sheel* ; and cp. Mawer,

[1] H. Steffens, *Versbau und Sprache des me. stabr. Gedichtes 'Wars of Alexander'* (Bonn Dissertation, 1901) and Joseph Fischer, *Die stabende Langzeile in den Werken des Gawain-Dichters*, pp. 4 and 64 (Bonn Dissertation, 1901 and *Bonner Beiträge*, xi). With the *won-wohnung* theory, we may further cp. *C.M.* 5375–6 (C) : 'I giue him *woningsted to wāle* (r. *māle*) (so F ; G and T have *to lend(e)* and *end(e)*). But the expression *to wale* is by no means confined to phrases of dwelling : cf. *C.M.* (C) 7187–8 : 'Siþen he ches a wijf *to wāle*, | Dalidam, him broght in *bāle*.'

'The Old Kingdom of Northumbria' in the Ridgeway 'Festgabe' (1913), pp. 306 ff.; s.v. *Eshells* (pl.-n.): "1225 (Hexham Priory, etc. *Surtees Soc.*), Eskile*scales*: 1226 Eskin*schell.* The suffix shews variation between Scd. *scale* (O.N. *skali* = 'hut,' 'shed' put up for temporary purposes), and Engl. *shiel* in common dialectal use with similar force (cf. Lindkvist *M.E. Pl.-Ns.* etc., p. 190)."

Even Fischer cannot accept Luick's suggestion of a verb connected with *shale*, and the sense given by the Fischer-Steffens suggestion is ridiculous. If we keep the simple and natural translation given by Morris, the possible violence done to grammar and metre is infinitely less than that done to the sense by accepting any of the German suggestions.

(5) ll. 1489 ff.:

> 'ȝet I kende yow of kyssyng,' quod þe clere þenne,
> Quere-so countenaunce is couþe, quikly to clayme,
> Þat bicums vche a knyȝt, þat cortaysy vses.
> 'Do way,' quod þat derf mon, 'my dere, þat speche,
> For þat durst I not do, lest I denayed were,
> If I were werned, I were wrang I-wysse, ȝif I profered.'
> 'Ma fay,' quod þe mere wyf, 'ȝe may not be werned,
> ȝe ar stif in-noghe to constrayne wyth strenkþe, ȝif yow lykez,
> ȝif any were so vilanous þat yow devaye wolde.'

The word *devaye* in l. 1497 is here the difficulty. The MS. has *de vaye*: Morris at first printed *denaye*, as an intelligible word which suited the context; Gollancz in 1897 restored the *de vaye* of the MS., printing it as one word; this is kept in the 1912 revision of the text[1]. The *v-* is needed for alliteration, as pointed out by Dr T. G. Foster[2]; and as it is also the MS. reading, it is better to try and translate it, than to emend the text. Mrs Wright suggested[3] that we should consider *devaye* as connected with *devall* < F. *devaller* = 'slide *or* go down' given by Cotgrave, and compared *E.D.D.* s.v. *Devall*, vb and sb, Sc. Irel. Nhb. etc., = 'halt,' 'stop,' 'cease,' 'desist': "this might have been confused with *denaye* in 1493 above: *tr.* 'if anyone were so ill-mannered that she would wish you to stop' (*or* 'would wish to stop you')." Apart from the phonological difficulties involved in this theory, the *N.E.D.* only quotes intransitive uses of *devall*, and none of these before eighteenth century Scotch texts.

Nor do I think *de vaye* can be for *do way* (even if that phrase could be used in such a context), for this would not only presuppose the

[1] The *N.E.D.* has no *Devay(e)*, but quotes this passage s.v. *Deny*, 6.

[2] *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. i. pp. 53–5: 'I don't know how *devaye* is to be interpreted.'

[3] *Englische Studien*, xxxvi, pp. 209 ff.

frequent MS. confusion of *o* and *e*, and the occasional *v* for *w*, but also the presence of a rare *-e* in *way*.

I propose to take *de vaye* as one word, as printed by Gollancz, and to derive it < O.F. *de(s)veier*, *-oier*, *-eer*[1] = 'défendre,' 'prohiber,' 'interdire,' 'empêcher,' 'refuser' < L.L. *dēvetāre*[2]. The following are examples of this use: *Fierabras* (as quoted by Herrtage, l. 4837 of the E.E.T.S. *Ferumbras*): 'Ains puis n'i ot pasage ne porte *deveee*, | Ains s'en entra dedens la compaigne honneree.' Cf. *Karls Reise* (ed. Koschwitz 1907), p. 25, l. 409: 'Nule rien qu'il demandent ne lor fut *deveet*'; *Chev. au Cygne* (Reiff.) 12099: 'Fors ung tout seul pumier que tu leur *deveas*': *Vies des Saints* (MS. Lyon 697, f. 13c): 'Quand il li fist mengier du fruit ki li estoit devees': *Lancelot* (MS. Fribourg, 66c): 'Ge *devee* a toz cels qui cest part vendront que il ne viegnent amont': *Gd. Chron. de France* iv. 23 (P. Paris): 'ceus qui le passage lui *deveoient*[3].'

Or, again, it *might* be < O.F. *Desvoier* (*-eier*, *-aier*, *dev(o)ier*) = 'pousser hors de la voie,' 'écarter,' 'égarer,' 'détourner, 'placer loin de la route,' 'à l'écart,' and *fig.* 'faire écarter du devoir, de l'honneur; égarer[4]': < L. *dēviāre*. Though this meaning and derivation are not so satisfactory, we may remember that our author is one of the two mentioned by the *N.E.D.* as using *avay* < O.F. *avier*, *aveie-* < L. *adviāre* = 'teach,' 'instruct'; cf. *Pearl*, 709 (= 710 Osgood): 'He loke on bok and be *awayed* | How *etc.*' *Cleanness*, 1311[5].

It is possible, though not probable, that our author here thought of both verbs, *deveier* and *de(s)veier*; and while primarily meaning 'deny,' 'refuse,' 'hinder,' 'stop,' meant to have a backward glance at the ironical sense: 'Faire écarter du devoir.'

In any case, *devaye* < O.F. *deveier* < L.L. *dēvetāre* = 'refuse,' 'deny,' 'hinder,' seems to meet the requirements of text, alliteration, phonology, and sense.

[When I wrote the note on *Angard* which appeared in the *M.L.R.* for April 1913, I had not seen Professor Skeat's note on the word in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* for 1903–6 (pt ii, p. 247), where he considers the *angard*, *angart*, forms to be ghost-words for *augard*, etc. I should like to correct the reference in the last line of my article from 'l. 936' to 'll. 1072, 1075, 1097.']

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

[1] Godefroy, s.v. *Deveer*.
[2] Cf. Du Cange, s.v. *Devetare*.
[3] Cf. La Curne de Ste Palaye, s.v. *Desveer* = 'défendre.'
[4] Godefroy, s.v. and cf. La C. de S. P., s.v. *Desvoyer* = 'tirer de la voye, du chemin: De là, au figuré, on l'employoit pour détourner, dissuader.'
[5] Shoreham, who also uses it, is made in T. Wright's edition to use *aneye*, *anaye*.

THE ABBÉ PRÉVOST AND SHAKESPEARE.

Had the Abbé Prévost written nothing but his appreciation of Shakespeare, he would be entitled to remembrance. To his own countrymen he is famous as the author of *Manon Lescaut*; to English readers he is interesting as the first Frenchman who drew attention to the intrinsic merits of Shakespeare's works. Prévost's investigations into English literature are of genuine importance. In 1731 he was first struck by the ignorance which prevailed in France respecting England. He had then returned home after a three years' stay in England, whither he had gone in 1728, in consequence of a quarrel with the Benedictines of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and he resolved to publish his impressions of the country he had visited. Hence the issue in 1731 of his *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité*, which contains piquant observations on the idiosyncracy of the English, and a shrewd judgement on English literature. The *Mémoires*, it may be noted, appeared three years before Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques*. Shakespeare is not, indeed, specially mentioned by Prévost; but in a list of examples, cited to support the contention that, with greater regularity, the productions of the English stage would equal (and perhaps surpass) those of the French or ancient Greek theatre, *Hamlet* is given first place. Prévost again visited England in 1733, and soon set to work on *Le Pour et Contre*, a journal which came out at irregular intervals during the next seven years. His main object was to popularize English literature in France; in the fourteenth volume we have the most generous and informed criticism of Shakespeare yet formulated by a French writer. When compared with Voltaire's meagre comments, Prévost's appreciations will be found to prove his importance as a *vulgarisateur* of Shakespeare's works in France. No doubt Voltaire did more than Prévost to stimulate interest in these works; but to stir curiosity is one thing, and to illuminate with information is another. Voltaire's immense vogue entailed consequences. When he described Shakespeare as a 'drunken savage,' he conveyed to Frenchmen the impression that

the English dramatist was an illiterate barbarian for whom the 'rules' of dramaturgy did not exist. This impression Prévost sought to remove, and, in dealing with Shakespeare in *Le Pour et Contre*, his chief concern is to defend the dramatist's attitude to prevailing literary conventions.

In attempting this quasi-apologetic task, he ran counter to most contemporary critics, English and French. By the latter, ignorance of the ancients and neglect of the 'rules' were regarded as heinous offences. Prévost carried the war into the enemy's camp and readily admitted that Shakespeare was guilty of both 'offences.' As to the first charge, it is now doubtful whether Shakespeare was really as lacking in classical learning as Prévost assumes; but, lest there should be any doubt respecting what was probably accepted as a fact, the Abbé is at pains to prove his assertion. Shakespeare, he maintains, received little education, and no classical training whatever. There is nothing in his works which appears to be borrowed or imitated from the ancients. But it must not be thought that Shakespeare's ignorance of these matters impoverished his plays; on the contrary, this omission in his education was a positive advantage. A knowledge of the ancients might have made him more 'correct,' but a regularity, so laboriously acquired, would have diminished 'cette chaleur, cette impétuosité, ce délire admirable, si l'on ose s'exprimer ainsi, qui éclate dans ses moindres productions. Il n'y a personne qui ne lise avec plus de plaisir ces pensées neuves, ces imaginations extraordinaires qui lui sont si familières, que la simple traduction d'un passage grec ou latin, avec quelque art et quelque agrément qu'il eût pu le rendre dans notre langue[1].' However, Shakespeare had a sufficient smattering of Latin, says Prévost, to enable him to scatter a few tags about his works: as, for instance, in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

'Shakespeare did not need the "rules"; they would probably have hampered him.' Such, reduced to its lowest terms, is Prévost's criticism of Shakespeare's attitude to literary *bienséances*. The poet did not choose to rely on Art alone for guidance; his compass was Nature[2]. But this does not imply that he allowed imagination to run riot, that he flouted all principles of judgement and taste: if he did not conform to all the rules, this was because 'his manner of thinking was so elevated above the ordinary as not to need the help of guidance and

[1] *Le Pour et Contre*, vol. XIV, p. 28. This confession that Shakespeare would have attained regularity at the cost of spontaneity is interesting, coming, as it does, from a Frenchman writing in the first half of the eighteenth century.

[2] *Le Pour et Contre*, vol. XIV, p. 301.

method.' Prévost's final remark is notable for its discrimination: 'Il y aurait donc de l'injustice à vouloir le juger par les règles de l'art, puis qu'il ne les a jamais connues. C'est au Tribunal du bon sens qu'il faut le citer.'

In the historical plays especially, Shakespeare was justified in rejecting the 'unities,' so as to preserve the actual events of history and their fit duration; his neglect of the 'rules' is insignificant beside the merits of these plays—the depicting of manners, the portraiture of character, the expression of sentiments, the play of passions: 'on ne trouvera presque rien dans toutes ses œuvres qui ne puisse être justifié, et de toutes parts il s'y présente des beautés auxquelles on ne saurait accorder trop d'éloges.' In the plays, the plots of which are taken from English and Roman history, the characters are faithfully limned, and, so far from attempting to preserve the unities of time and place, Shakespeare boldly reveals in his titles that he proposes to present an entire career, as *The Life of King John.* Much more skill, so Prévost insists, was needed to sustain a character, and preserve constant consistency and force, throughout a long history, than to present certain aspects of that character in a few fleeting episodes connected by the 'unities.' The character of Henry VI is a masterpiece, 'où l'on trouve ce qu'il y a de plus précieux dans nos meilleurs historiens.' Henry convinces by virtue of his simplicity, patience, feebleness: on the other hand, justice is done to his good qualities, and interest and sympathy are awakened by representing him as saintly, disinterested, resigned to the decrees of Providence. In Prévost's view, such brilliancy of dramatic conception and execution would have been impossible had Shakespeare submitted to the 'rules': 'C'est dans ces grands contrastes, où l'auteur s'attache à la nature des choses et la fortifie sans jamais s'écarter, que son génie brille avec bien plus d'éclat qu'il n'aurait jamais fait par l'observation de quelques petites règles qu'il aurait suivies froidement sur l'autorité d'autrui.'

Notwithstanding his ignorance of the 'rules,' Shakespeare often rises above the 'masters' of antiquity, and Prévost illustrates his case by an interesting comparison between *Hamlet* and the *Electra.* Sophocles' play, at first replenished with true pathos, degenerates into an outrage on Nature and humanity; the scene in which Orestes slays his mother transgresses the elementary laws of nature, and is all the more censurable for being composed by one of the 'maîtres de l'art—ceux d'après lesquels on a formé les règles.' Shakespeare, on the other hand, has represented Hamlet with as much respect for his father, and as much

resolution to avenge his death, as Sophocles has shown in picturing Orestes. Hamlet feels the same horror at his mother's crime, and, in his case, horror is deepened by suspicion of a worse iniquity. But Shakespeare's inherent good sense and critical judgement prevented his offending the susceptibilities of the spectators by the spectacle of a son murdering his mother: 'Avec quelle habileté notre poète n'a-t-il pas su écarter toute indécence de cette nature, en mettant dans la bouche de l'esprit une défense absolue de penser à cette horrible vengeance.'

Having championed Shakespeare's position towards literary conventions, Prévost goes on to give examples of the poet's dramatic craftsmanship in dramatic-drawing and in the handling of plots. Apart from their intrinsic value, Prévost's criticisms of *The Tempest* and *The Merry Wives* have an additional interest from the fact that Voltaire, in his *Lettres anglaises*, was concerned solely with Shakespearean tragedy, and does not mention Shakespeare in his *Lettre sur la Comédie*. For this fatal omission Prévost made amends. *The Tempest* he calls 'one of the most celebrated' of Shakespeare's comedies. The English rightly set a high value on this play, and maintained that the 'rules' were observed in it; indeed, Prévost continues, characters and style are alike irreproachable. The critic announces his intention of translating the scene between Miranda and the Prince of Naples, 'qui est remarquable en effet par mille traits dignes de la réputation de Shakespear[1]' (*sic*). Anticipating the possible objection that the magic element is ridiculous, Prévost pleads that Shakespeare's use of magic was everywhere justifiable, and quotes an English critic to support this view. Again, he argues that Dryden was not far wrong in calling Falstaff the most perfect character in the range of comedy. The two intrigues in *The Merry Wives* are dovetailed with greater skill than in most English plays. After quoting the judgements of contemporary English critics, Prévost gives his own opinion of *The Merry Wives*, a piece which he has read several times and which he has seen played by the most celebrated actors in London. Prévost's conclusion is that, allowing for certain faults which all sensible Englishmen would readily recognize, the invention and development of the intrigue, and the character-drawing, deserved the praise bestowed on them; and, regretting that a

[1] Prévost constantly deplores the fact that the French had no good translation of Shakespeare, and that they were reduced to making translations of English criticisms of the plays. In *Le Pour et Contre*, he gave analyses of the plots of the chief plays, hoping thus to remedy the defect in some measure.

comedy so renowned should be unknown south of the Channel, he calls for a translation of the play into French[1].

Prévost's praise of *Othello* is less whole-hearted. He detects two grave flaws in the plot: firstly, Desdemona's passion for a Moor was highly improbable; secondly, the handkerchief episode was not sufficient warrant for Othello's ferocious jealousy. The character of Iago, however, can be easily defended as in consonance with reason and probability. To say that vice should not be represented on the stage is to betray a narrow mind; virtue is best shown in opposition to vice; true virtue implies a knowledge, and consequent hatred of vice: to present such a villain as Iago on the stage was no worse than to represent the vast consequences of love, ambition, or anger. Prévost completes his remarks on Shakespeare with a short reference to *Hamlet* which, as he repeats, the English rightly consider the masterpiece of the 'Prince of their Stage.' Again lamenting the absence of a good translation of the original, and deploring the fact that the French knew *Hamlet* merely from translations of English criticisms of it, he offers his readers, by way of compensation, the story of the plot, which he gives in detail.

Such is the Abbé Prévost's estimate of Shakespeare—'one of the greatest geniuses who have ever honoured dramatic poetry.' The scope of modern criticism is not much wider than Prévost's. At a time when literary judgements were apt to be crude and cramped, Prévost rejected current standards and attained an independent personal point of view; his test of excellence is—not the rigid observance of artificial 'rules,' but—the intrinsic value of the works under discussion. In two respects Prévost may fairly be said to have anticipated modern developments. He employed, and was among the first to employ, the historical method: he considered Shakespeare's works in their relation to the age in which they were produced. Unluckily the method is misapplied, and his observations on this head show less than his customary acumen and accuracy: assuming that Shakespeare lived in a more or less barbarous age, when ignorance and bad taste prevailed and when the drama was amorphous, he alleges that these circumstances go towards extenuating such breaches of the 'rules' as the dramatist may have committed. Manifestly, Prévost had not wholly shaken off the academic orthodoxy which was the base of eighteenth century criticism; but this is not surprising, for contemporary English critics were no better informed concerning Elizabethan literature.

[1] Prévost hints vaguely at making such a translation himself: we have no trace of it, if it was ever begun.

Again, Prévost used what we may call the 'geographical' method of criticism. Every country, he avers, has its own customs and 'mode of thought'; hence every country has its characteristic literary standards, and an excellent work, which satisfies the standards of one country, may easily fail to satisfy the standards of another country. Reviewing *The Merry Wives*, he says it was only after he had been long conversant with English tastes and manners that he began to think favourably of the play; were it not that he allowed for differences of custom and 'mode of thought,' he would, he confesses, have passed over as coarse and ridiculous innumerable points which, according to English canons of taste and beauty, are so many strokes of genius. By his faculty of distinguishing between the essential features of the literatures in different countries, and by his gift of indicating the precise cause of such distinctions, Prévost was not only in a fair way to assimilate the spirit of the Shakespearean drama: he incidentally made a useful contribution to the literature of cosmopolitanism. To comprehend English works, he perceived the necessity of being 'Anglicized,' of becoming imbued with English literary ideals, of growing acquainted with English manners; these conditions were peculiarly needed for the due comprehension of Shakespeare, whose works differ radically from French classical tragedy inasmuch as they teem with contemporary ideas and allusions to contemporary manners.

That Prévost fulfilled these necessary conditions is indisputable; further, he fulfilled the conditions precedent to a right understanding of Shakespeare. The most enduring impression left by his appreciations is that of complete sympathy with his subject. He succeeded in clearing his mind of prepossessions which had been carefully fostered by dull academic routine. In some respects Prévost is more akin to the nineteenth century than to the eighteenth; at the lowest he represents a transition between the two centuries. He was by no means faultless; he allowed his imagination an unfettered liberty; he gave free (perhaps too free) expression to his passion; he was Rousseau's forerunner in the cultivation of the 'ego.' His impetuous temperament enabled him to follow Shakespeare in his emotional flights, and in the works of the great dramatist he saw the perfect expression of that primitive energy which verges on ferocity—that 'poésie farouche' which stirs the soul to its depths, and which was wholly wanting in the conscientious imitations of the ancients so much in vogue in France. When originals were available, Prévost disdained translations, and a close study of these originals, joined to the accurate knowledge of the English

people which he had obtained during his two visits to this country, placed him *en rapport* with Shakespeare. His personal tastes, too, helped to complete his understanding; he was an ardent lover of that liberty, that spirit of individualism, which is a characteristic and constant trait of English literature.

The Abbé Prévost's share in the revelation of the authentic Shakespeare to the French is of real literary significance. In any description of Shakespeare's vogue on the continent, Prévost's name deserves a prominent place. Among Prévost's achievements in the sphere of literary 'vulgarizations,' his contribution to Shakespearean criticism is only less important than his renderings of Richardson's novels.

J. C. Carpenter.

Longton.

DEUTSCHE PROSAFRAGMENTE DES XII. JAHRHUNDERTS.

I.

Bruchstücke des sog. Züricher Arzneibuchs vermischt mit anderen medicinischen Traktaten.

1. Überlieferung. Die im folgenden abgedruckten Bruchstücke sind auf uns gekommen als Schutzblätter (1* und 224*) des im letzten Viertel des 14. Jahrhunderts geschriebenen Codex Misc. hist. 146 E. VII. 19 der kgl. Bibliothek zu Bamberg[1], deren Verwaltung ich meinen herzlichsten Dank ausspreche für die zuvorkommende Ermöglichung, die Hs. auf der hiesigen Seminarbibliothek benutzen zu können. Sie enthält neben einer lateinischen *Vita B. Agnetis de Praga* das Leben der hl. Klara und ihrer Schwester Agnes nach Bonaventura (A.S. August, tom. 2, p. 754 ff.), ein Loblied auf St Klara und Briefe der Heiligen an Agnes von Prag in deutscher Sprache und ward von Schwester Katharina Hofmannin geschrieben, die 1380–82 und wieder 1389–93 als Äbtissin des St Klara-Klosters zu Nürnberg nachweisbar ist (Ussermann, *Episcopatus Bambergensis*, p. 443, 4). Es ist möglich, dass die beiden Blätter, die wir mit B bezeichnen wollen, gleich nach Fertigstellung der Hs. ihr vor- und nachgeheftet wurden; oder der Buchbinder degradierte sie erst zu dieser Dienstleistung. Reste des alten (Kloster-) Einbands (Holzdeckel mit rotem Lederbezug) weisen spätestens auf das 15. Jh. Jedesfalls dürfen wir mit grösster Wahrscheinlichkeit vermuten, dass der Codex des 12. Jh., dessen traurige Überreste hier vorliegen, um 1400 sich im St Klara-Kloster zu Nürnberg befand. Vielleicht fördert eine Untersuchung der noch übrig gebliebenen Hss. des Klosters andere Reste desselben zutage. Das Pergament der beiden Blätter, deren jedes noch einen als Falz benutzten schmalen Streifen des zu ihm gehörigen Doppelblatts der Lage zeigt, ist

[1] Vgl. F. Leitschuh, *Katalog der Handschriften der kgl. Bibliothek zu Bamberg* (1895), 1, 2, S. 241. Leitschuh macht auf die Bruchstücke aufmerksam, setzt ihre Schrift aber ins 13. Jh., weswegen sie wohl bis jetzt unbeachtet geblieben sind.

gelblich und etwas beschmutzt. Um sie dem Band anzupassen, hat man die Blätter am obern, untern und äussern Rand beschnitten, was zu mehr oder weniger grossem Textverlust führte. Ursprünglich dürfte die Seite 37–38 Zeilen enthalten haben, da die Textlücke zwischen 2^r und 2^v kaum über den Umfang von 1–2 Zeilen hinausgehen kann. Die Blattmasse sind nun folgende: Bl. 1, Höhe, am innern Rand gemessen, 18·2 cm.; am äussern 17·5; Breite 13·3 cm. Bl. 2 misst 18·2 (resp. 17·8) × 13 cm. Als Schmuck finden sich, je den Beginn eines neuen Traktats hervorhebend, zwei rote Initialbuchstaben, deren erster (D) mindestens 6 Zeilen hoch war, während der zweite—ein H mit eingeschriebenem Z—eine Höhe von 5 Zeilen hat; ausserdem stehen rote Kapitale zu Anfang eines neuen Abschnitts (resp. Recepts), und rot sind auch die (lateinischen) Überschriften. Weder Linien, eingedrückte oder Bleistiftlinien, noch Stichlöcher sind zu sehen. Die Schrift der beiden Blätter — eine klare, gefällige Minuskel — gehört m. E. in die erste Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts. Sie zeigt grosse Ähnlichkeit mit der der ersten Hand des Göttweiger Codex Lit. A. Loco 2. (S. das Faksimile bei Chroust, *Denkmäler der Schreibekunst des Mittelalters*, Ser. II. Lieferung XIV (1913), Tafel 2a). Als bemerkenswert hebe ich hervor die Form des *r*, dessen Schaft meist deutlich über die Zeile hinunter reicht, und, wo es im Auslaut steht, einen stark geschwungenen Doppelhaken zeigt. Die andere runde *r* Form in der Ligatur mit *o* zeigt sich nur einmal in *dolor̃* 2^r, 2. Das *z* erhebt sich zwar zumeist etwas über die Zeilenhöhe, hat aber, abgesehen von zwei Kapitalen auf 2^r Z. 28 und 2^v Z. 18, nirgend die -h- artige (baiuvarisch-alemannische) Gestalt. Die überwiegende Form des *s* ist an allen Stellen des Wortes die lange (*ſ*) und sein Schaft, sowie der des *f*, endet meist abgeschrägt auf der Zeile, doch findet sich im Anlaut, besonders in den Wörtchen *so, síu* und *salt*, ein paarmal auch im Auslaut (1^r, 8 *wis*, 2^v, 23 *gibs*), die runde (*s*) Form des Buchstaben. Desgleichen gehen im An- und Inlaut *d* und ȸ (die unciale Form) nebeneinander. Die Langschäfte der *l, d, h, k, l, p* sind zumeist steil abgeschrägt, nicht gespalten oder gegabelt; von Buchstabenverbindungen wäre nur *ft* zu erwähnen und die zweier *v* zu *w*, das dem Schreiber bereits ganz geläufig ist und öfters, z. B., 2^r, 29 *wrz*; 2^v 16 *wnde*; 2^v, 21 *wnderlich* auch *wu* vertritt. Seltener stehen *uu, u, v*, z. B., *ſuuíne* 2^v, 16; *uulnus* 2^v, 17; *ſuínede* 1^v, 8; *uarua* 2^r, 35; *niveneſ* 1^v, 11; *vermude* 1^r, 24. Einen Strich über dem *i* verwendet der Schreiber nur — und dies sehr spärlich — wo das *i* (resp. *j*) mit einem *n* oder *u* zusammenstösst, z. B., 1^r, 11 *íuchet* (consonant. *i*), *ſuínede* 1^v, 8; *ſuuíne* 2^v, 16; *síu* 2^v, 19; einmal zwischen *t*

und *c* in dem lateinischen Worte *frenetícus* 1r, 13. Als Interpunktionszeichen tritt nur der Punkt auf, sowohl zur Satztrennung als auch einzelner Satzglieder (besonders in der Aufzählung), doch ohne feste Regel.

2. Der Inhalt der Bruchstücke. Sie setzen 1r, 1–20 mitten im Satz in einem Traktat ein, der, soweit sich überhaupt eine Überschrift findet, handschriftlich als *Analogius* oder *Analogium Hypocratis* bezeichnet wird. Nach einer Einleitung, die in das von F. Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, 33, S. 286 ff. behandelte Gebiet der fabulistischen Quellenangaben[1] gehört, verbreitet sich der Traktat, der hier übrigens nur zum kleinen Teil übersetzt ist, über die Anzeichen des tötlichen Ausgangs von Krankheiten. Er ähnelt, ist aber nicht identisch mit einem in Hss. vielfach auftretenden *tractatus Ypocratis de signis mortis*[2]. Ich gebe den entsprechenden Teil des lateinischen Originals unter dem Text nach Add. 8928 (xi. Jh.), Bl. 6v des Britischen Museums mit gelegentlicher Beiziehung von Harleian 337 (xii. Jh.), Bl. 72r. Deutsch scheint sich das Stück auch in der Baseler Hs. B. xi. 8 (14. Jahrhundert) erhalten zu haben; s. Haupt, *Altdeutsche Blätter*, 2, S. 133.

Darauf folgen 1r, 21–1v, 23 (*ander*) und 2r, 1–2v, 36 Recepte, die augenscheinlich derselben lateinischen Sammlung entstammen, auf der das sogenannte *Züricher Arzneibuch* (Z) beruht. Freilich decken sie sich nur z. T. mit diesem; so fehlen Z alle jene Recepte, die hier 2r, 7–2v, 16 (*ze drinkene under*) stehen. Im einzelnen wird Übereinkommen und Fehlen klar werden durch die an den Rand des Textes gesetzten Zahlen, die sich auf den Wiederabdruck des *Züricher Arzneibuches* durch F. Wilhelm S. 53–64 der *Denkmäler Deutscher Prosa des* 11. *und* 12. *Jahrhunderts*, München, 1914, beziehen. In seinem Kommentar zu dem Buche wird F. Wilhelm auch die Quellenfrage des *Züricher Arzneibuches* erörtern.

Bl. 1v, 23 bricht der Text eines dieser Recepte mitten im Satz, ja

[1] S. besonders S. 290 f., 324 f.

[2] Er findet sich z. B. in den Hss. Add. 15107 (15. Jh. aus Erfurt) und Sloane 282 (15. Jh.); in der Hss. Add. 34111 (15. Jh.) steht Bl. 231r eine englische Übersetzung desselben unter dem Titel: *Secreta ypocratis*. Darauf folgt Bl. 235v die Übertragung des *Analogius* unter der Überschrift: *Now here begynneþ ypocras his priuetes in a noþer manner*, ein Beweis, dass schon dieser Schreiber die Ähnlichkeit der beiden Traktate merkte. Die fabulistische Quellenangabe der *Secreta* (= *de signis mortis*) mag hier in der englischen Übersetzung folgen: 'Here begynneþ þe priuetes of þe gode man and a wyse þat was yclepid ypocras þe whiche man whan he drew to deþe yclosed were þes priuetes in a case of euore and leyde þis case in his sepulchre wiþ him þat þes same priuetes ne shulde beo descouered among no man. Now Cesare wolde se þe sepulcre of þis gode man Ypocras and þe cors was depe ydolue in þe erþe and þen Cesar þe Emperoure dide make renoueld þe sepulcre And þe body was founden hole and sound þe whiche body was presentid befor Cesar wiþ þe case of euore in which case were founden þes priuetes and Cesar proued þes same priuites and hem shewed and sent to oþer frendes.'

mitten im Worte *ander* | *halb* ab und fährt erst 2^{v}, 16 mit dem zweiten Teil dieser Zusammensetzung fort. Das kann sich nur aus einem Fehler der Vorlage unseres Schreibers oder der eines Vorgängers erklären, sei's dass eine Lage oder einzelne ihrer Blätter verbunden waren, oder sei's — und dies dünkt mich wahrscheinlicher — dass sie aus Einzelblättern bestand, die in Unordnung geraten waren. Für die mechanische Arbeitsweise unseres Schreibers ist dies auf jeden Fall ein glänzendes Zeugnis. An die Bruchstelle des Receptes 1^{v}, 23 —*ander* war also das letzte Wort der Rückseite eines Blattes der Vorlage — schliesst sich unmittelbar ebenfalls mitten im Satz einsetzend — also waren *der machint* die beiden ersten Worte des nächsten, an die unrechte Stelle geratenen Blattes der Vorlage — der Bruchteil eines anderen medicinischen Traktats, der nun den Rest der Seite, d. h. bis 1^{v}, 31 füllt. Dafür kann ich wieder die lateinische Quelle nachweisen, deren Wortlaut, soweit er für uns in Betracht kommt, unter dem Text abgedruckt ist. Auch dieser Tractat steht in der Hs. Add. 8928 Bl. 5^{v} zwischen dem *Liber Ysidori de medicina* (= *Etymologiarum* liber IV. Migne, t. 82, p. 183, etc.), und dem oben aufgeführten *Analogius Ypocratis*. Seinen Inhalt kennzeichnet der einleitende Satz: 'Vera hec est dinamis et monstratio omnium medicamentorum quę ad artem medicinę scientiamque pertinet quam si plenissime intellegant hi qui artem medicinę profitentur, semper eos medicina per omne adiutorium in omnem curam adiuuavit quod si [non] neglegens adsiduitate et plenus fiducia huius doctrinę aliquis fuerit, non facile decipitur in cura.' Im Vorlauf der Einleitung wendet sich der Verfasser an einen gewissen Niane; 'In secundo [libro] tibi, karissime pater Niane, omnium pigmentorum intellectum, qualitatem et effectum posui(t).'

Wir sehen, die beiden zufällig erhaltenen Blätter sind schätzbare Zeugen einer offenbar ziemlich umfangreichen Übersetzungstätigkeit auf medicinisch-naturwissenschaftlichem Gebiet. Es wird sich daher lohnen, auf die Frage nach ihrer und ihrer Vorlage örtliche und zeitliche Entstehung etwas näher einzugehen.

3. Die Sprache des Schreibers und seiner Vorlage. Dass wir es nicht mit einer Originalaufzeichnung zu tun haben, hat uns bereits die Textstörung gelehrt. Fehler, die sich als Abschreibeversehen leicht erklären, treten hinzu: Ausfall von *unde* (?) 1^{r}, 5, von *wider* 1^{r}, 22, von *zedribez* 2^{v}, 28; noch beweisender wäre 1^{r}, 25 *vluet*, wenn es, wie ich vermute, für *bluet* steht.

Zur Lautlehre. A. Konsonantismus. (*a*) Labiale: westgerm. *b* ist

ausser in *pugnun* (= *bungun*) 2^v, 18 (s. Anmerkung zum Text) an keiner Wortstelle, auch nicht im Auslaut, zu *p* geworden, vgl. *gib demo* 2^v, 19, vgl. 2^r, 3, 26, *grab under* 1^r, 1 und auch sonst häufig vor vokal. Anlaut. Die Spirans *v* erscheint zweimal in *ove* (Conj. und Praepos.) 1^r, 18 neben *ob(e)*, 1^r, 17. 1^v, 22 und *ober* (= *obe er*), 1^r, 19. Weinhold, § 324 und 334. Fremdes *p* als *b* in *beneboumes* 2^v, 7, *bapelun* 2^v, 35, *gibs* 2^v, 23, *gebostemoten* 2^r, 15 (gegen *postema* 2^r, 9; *gepuluerede* 2^r, 17, *puluer* 2^r, 31, *pech* 2^v, 22). *p* ist im Anlaut unverschoben: *persich* 1^r, 28, *peffer* 2^r, 14, *pannun* 2^r, 30. 2^v, 26; im Inlaut dagegen nach *r* und in der Verdopplung *pf* (*ph*, *pph* geschrieben): *scarphen* 1^r, 30, *scarphe* (Subst.) 1^v, 27, *epphes* 2^r, 18. 2^v, 4; hinter *m* > *f* in *damfedon* 2^r, 22. Im In- u. Auslaut nach Vocalen zu *ff*, *f*: *leffela*, 1^v, 17, *peffer* 2^r, 14, *slafen* 2^r, 16, *ofenen* (wo die Raumverhältnisse gegen *ff* sprechen) 1^r, 4, *saf* 2^v, 3.

f, nur vor *u*, *uo* und *t* als *f* geschrieben: *fuor* 1^r, 2, *dafure* 1^r, 2, 1^v, 31, *funfta* 1^v, 7, *fulenden* 2^r, 23, *semfte* 1^v, 26, *after* 2^r, 16 u. in dem lateinischen Wort *frenetícus* 1^r, 13; sonst d. i. vor *a*, *e*, *i*, *o* und Konsonanten *u*, *v*, z. B., *vile* 1^r, 15, *velt* 1^v, 10, *vastendo* 1^v, 12, *uor* 1^v, 19, *vleche* 1^r, 18, *vlieht* 2^v, 7, etc. Als *w* in *wirne wines* 2^r, 10 (doch *uirnen* 2^v, 12) und wohl auch *uuanda* (= *vant da*) 1^r, 4. Wechsel zwischen *f* (*v*) und *b* in *havene* 2^v, 8: *habene* 2^r, 12.

(*b*) Gutturale. *g* im Auslaut als *-c*: *honec* 2^r, 20, *dinc* 1^v, 22; als *-ch*: *mach* 1^r, 14 und ebenso *ng* > *nch*: *lanch* 1^r, 2 (Franck, *Altfränkische Grammatik*, § 106, 4); als *-h* in *trahheit* 1^v, 28 (Fr., § 106, 2). Für *j* vor *i*, *e* in *chugine* 1^v, 11, *sage* 2^v, 25, daneben *saige* 2^v, 35.

k im Anlaut erhalten in: *keiser* 1^r, 2, *kalden* 1^r, 16 (*ca-* 1^r, 15, vgl. auch *claga* 1^v, 9, *curbiz* 2^r, 28, *crut* 2^v, 19, *crebesces* 2^v, 31), *kumet* 2^r, 8, *kinnebacchun* 2^v, 30, doch *ch-*: *chugine* 1^v, 11, *chinne* 1^r, 13, *chumeles* 2^r, 16. Im Inlaut nach *l* und *r* bleibt *-k-*: *gemolkena* 1^v, 11, *sterkene* 2^r, 17, nach *n* in *drinkene* 1^v, 4, 10, 18 etc., *lanke(suhte)* 2^r, 24, aber *lanche(sweren)* 1^v, 19; in der Verdopplung steht einfaches *-k-* in *drukenez* 2^v, 33, *-cc-* in *buccun* 2^r, 29, dagegen *-ch-* *druchene* 2^v, 36, *diche* 1^r, 10, 11, 13, *vleche* 1^r, 18, *iuchet* 1^r, 11; durch *-cch* bezeichnet in *kinnebacchun* 2^r, 30, *drucchez* 2^v, 13, wohl auch *dicche* 1^r, 15 für das überlieferte *dieche*, auch für *hh(ch)* < *k* findet sich *-cch-* einmal in *hecchedes* 2^v, 30 (= *Z.A.*), sonst *-ch-*, z. B., *machint* 1^v, 23. *sk* meist als *sc*: *mennisclichen* 1^r, 23, *scarphen* 1^r, 30, *gescoz* 1^v, 30, etc., nur drei *sch* in *mennische* 1^r, 9. 1^v, 28. 2^r, 25. Stets *salt* 1^v, 5, etc.

h im Auslaut < *hw*: *-nah* 2^v, 34 doch *nach* 1^r, 2; *th* für *ht*: *gewith* 1^v, 5. Die Verbindung *-hs-* erscheint als *-ss-* in *erwassen*

1r, 22 (Braune, § 154, 4; Franck, § 114, 2; *Z.f.d.A.* 21, 261). Ausfall des *-h-* durch Assimilation an *t* in *niwit* 1r, 14. 2r, 27, *iwet* 2r, 25, also in nebentoniger Silbe; in der Gruppe *lh* nach vokalischer Synkope *sale widun* 2v, 11, *Suelin* 1r, 16 (Franck, § 110, 3; Weinhold, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 490). Dagegen Einschub des *-h-* in *vlieht* 2v, 7. Erwähnenswert der Ausgleich des grammatischen Wechsels vom Plural her in *sige* (Imp.) 2r, 13, vielleicht durch Beeinflussung von *sîgan* (*Z.A. sich!*).

(*c*) Dentale. *d*: Im Anlaut durchgehend geblieben, also z. B. *dage* 1r, 12, *doub* 1r, 17, *du* 1r, 29, *dûch* 1r, 27, *deil* 1r, 30, etc. Ebenso im Inlaut zwischen Vokalen: *mide* 1r, 28. 2v, 29, *rodent* 1r, 13, *vermude* 1r, 24. 2r, 36; in den flektierten Formen des schw. Part. Prät. *gewndeden* 2v, 20, *gepulverede* 2r, 17 (doch *-ete* 2v, 18, *gemilwetun* 1v, 16 und *gebostemoten* 2r, 15); aber *muter wrz* 2r, 29, *situn* 2r, 34 und nach *r*: *harto* 2r, 32; nach *l*: *newolde* 1r, 6, *calden* 1r, 15, 16, *einvaldigemo* 1r, 29, *alden* 1v, 21. Im Auslaut wird *-d* zu *-t*: *gut* 1v, 12, *hůbet* 1r, 1, *mit* 1v, 18, *siut* 2r, 1, dagegen *siud* 2r, 3. 2r, 11. 2v, 12 in allen Fällen vor konsonantischem Anlaut des nächsten Wortes, also Nichtbeachtung des mhd. Auslautsgesetzes (vgl. auch *-b*). In diesem Verbum ist auch der grammatische Wechsel orthographisch nicht zum Ausdruck gebracht: *gesoden* 1v, 10. Nach *n*: *-bint* 1r, 27. 1v, 21, 23. 2r, 2 (gegenüber *gebindent* 1v, 30, aber *gebranta* 2v, 29), *hant* 1r, 10.

t zur Affrikata *z* (*c* in *lucelemo* 2v, 4, *k* in *kedrinkene* 2r, 3 Schreibfehler!) resp. zur Doppelspirans verschoben, die z. T. nach langem Vokal: *heizent* 1v, 25, 31, aber auch nach kurzem *nezelun* 2v, 36 vereinfacht erscheint; einmal *-sc-* in *crebesces* 2v, 31. Zweimal findet sich das inclinierte Pronom. *-ez* als *-et*: *zedribet* 2v, 26 und *uegetet* 2r, 32; es ist schwer zu sagen, ob der Häufigkeit der *ez* Schreibung gegenüber hier nur ein Schreibfehler vorliegt, der im zweiten Fall ja durch den gleichen Verbalausgang *-et* begünstigt wird, aber das unverschobene *-t* ist dem Schreiber auch im *stabe wrt* 2r, 6 entschlüpft gegenüber *muter wrz* 2r, 29, *wrzelun* 2v, 4. *tt* = *t* in *drita* 1v, 6 (Franck, § 91), doch *dritten* 2v, 13; als *-d-* in *luder* 2r, 4, also < *lū-tar*, Braune, § 92 u. 96 Anm. 4.

(*d*) Liquida und Nasale. Der Ausfall des *l* vor *st* in *geswust* 1r, 9 ist gewiss nur Schreibfehler. *m* vor germ. *f* ist geblieben in *semfte* 1v, 26, dagegen *funfta* 1v, 7. Über den Ausfall des *-n-* im part. pres. s. unter Flexion.

(*e*) Halbvokale. *w.* Über seine orthographischen Bezeichnungen s. oben S. 204. Die Gruppe *-iuw-* erscheint als *-iw-*: *niwez* 1v, 14, *niwen*

2^v, 8, als *iu(iv)*: *niuen* 2^v, 12, *geniven* 1^v, 11, auslautend *niu sie* 2^r, 7, *niv ez* 1^r, 25.

j. Durch *i* bezeichnet: *iuchet* 1^r, 11, *ioch* 1^r, 16. 1^v, 9; durch *g*, s. oben unter *g*.

B. Vokalismus. I. Vokale der Tonsilben: *a* > *o* in *joch*, 1^r, 16. 1^v, 9, *vone* 1^v, 20, *holene* 1^v, 20. Umlaut durch *e* bezeichnet: *leget* 1^r, 11, *swerent* 1^r, 17; *sterkene* 2^r, 17, *semfte* 1^v, 27; ohne Umlaut: *scarphe* (Subst.) 1^v, 27, *einvaldigemo* 1^r, 29 unter dem Einfluss von *scarph* (*scarphen* 1^r, 30) und *einfalt*; aber *damfedon* (part. pres.) 2^r, 22 < **dampfōn -ēn*?

ā; *nach, ane, geblasede*, etc. Umlaut durch *e* bezeichnet: *were* 1^r, 3, *mezlichen* 2^r, 12; dagegen unbezeichnet *neware* 1^r, 6, *sware* 1^v, 16, *lazest* 2^v, 2 (Paul, *Mhd. Gr.* § 156 Anm.), *sage* 2^v, 18, 25 (hier mit übergeschriebenem *seie*), *saige* 2^v, 35.

ë zu *i* gefärbt: *din* 1^r, 18, *dir* (< *thār* Relativpartikel) 2^r, 24, 27; durch *ei* bezeichnet *weillent* (*gluttinant*) 1^v, 29 (Weinhold, § 48); zu *ŏ* in *wola* 2^v, 13, *oder* 1^r, 29.

ĭ < vorgerm. *ë* vor *u*: *milch* 1^v, 3, 11, *hirzes* 2^v, 23; ahd. *ĭ* zu *e*: *zeginbonun* 2^r, 1; in schwachtoniger Silbe *iwet* 2^r, 25; zu *ie* in *dieche* 1^r, 15, wohl nur Schreibfehler für *dicche* der Vorlage (s. S. 207 unter *k*); zu *u* in *funfta* 1^v, 7 (*Beiträge*, XI, 290).

î erscheint als *ie* in *liebe* 1^v, 20, *sie* 2^r, 33 (Weinhold, § 107; Franck, § 26 Anm.); als *ē* in *bene* (= *pine*) *boumes* 2^v, 7, falls nicht Verkürzung des *ī* in l. *pīnus* anzunehmen ist, vgl. *Ahd. Gl.* III, 95, 13 *pinnbaum*, Weinhold, § 107; sonst *i*: *situn* 2^r, 34, etc.

ŭ erhalten vor *a* in *uber* 1^r, 2; Umlaut bleibt ohne Bezeichnung: *hulzen* 2^v, 27, *mugist* 1^v, 2, *chumeles* 2^r, 10, *curbiz* 2^r, 28, *dafure* 1^r, 2, vor Nas.+Kons.: *gebundelin* 2^v, 7, vor *tz*: *nuzent* 1^v, 24, *nuze* 1^v, 25, *nuzez* 2^r, 21.

ō durch *u* bezeichnet in *sv* 1^v, 2, doch wohl unter dem Einfluss des folgenden *du*, denn gleich vorher und sonst *so*.

ei sporadisch durch *e* bezeichnet: *zeheline* 2^r, 9. 2^v, 21 (doch *heilunge* 2^v, 6), *emo* 2^v, 8, gegenüber *einemo* 2^v, 12, *eimo* 2^v, 4; *zwe* n. pl. neutr. 2^r, 13, aber *zwei* 2^r, 9, vgl. Braune, § 44, 4. In *sweizes* 1^r, 19, ist *i* über der Zeile nachgetragen.

ie: *vierda* 1^v, 6, *hiez* 1^r, 4, *hie* 1^r, 21 etc.; durch *i* wiedergegeben in *briue* 2^v, 2, *di* 1^r, 11 acc. sgl. fem.; durch *ē* in *swe* 1^r, 8, 12 < *ēo* < *aiw* (Weinhold, § 489).

iu in *siucheda* 1^v, 15, *siut* 2^r, 1, 3, 2^v, 8, 12, *viure* 2^r, 13, *diu* 1^v, 11. 2^v, 1, *driu* 2^v, 6, 8 (*u* nachgetragen), *siu* 2^v, 19. Als *u*: *nun* 1^v, 4. Über die Lautgruppe *iuw* s. oben unter *w*.

ou bezeichnet (1) durch *ou, ov*: *hovbet* 1r, 24, 27, *doub* 1r, 17, *ouch* 2r, 26, *-boumes* 2v, 7. (2) *ŏ*: *hŏbet* 1r, 8. (3) *ů*: *hůbet* 1r, 1. (4) *o*: *wiroch* 2v, 22 (Braune, § 46, Anm. 3; Franck, § 34, 3), ebenso in der Lautgruppe *ouw*: *verdowent* 1v, 24, *dowen* 2r, 27, aber *ebehouwe* 1r, 24.

uo bezeichnet (1) durch *uo*: *fuor* 1r, 2. (2) *ů*: *bůch* 1r, 5, 7, 21, *ersůchte* 1r, 7. (3) *u*: *buchelechin* 1r, 1, *zu* 1r, 30, etc., *duch* 2r, 14. 2v, 34, *versuchen* 1v, 4, 23, *druse* 2r, 2, *gut* 1v, 12, 18, *vermude* 1r, 24, *husten* 1r, 10, *du* 1r, 29. 2r, 20. 2v, 24, 27, *muter* 2r, 29. Einfaches *u* steht auch für *üe* in *chugine* 1v, 11, *erkulen* 2v, 9, endlich auch für *uo* + *e* in **bluet* 1r, 25. (4) *o* in *wermoden* 2r, 36.

Es ist zu beachten, dass die *uo, ů* sämmtlich auf der ersten Seite stehen, später nur die monophthongischen Bezeichnungen, die also für den Schreiber wohl auch diesen Lautwert haben.

II. Mittel- und Endsilbenvokale.

-ô- im schw. Verb. II: *gebostemoten* 2r, 15, dagegen *gepuluerede* 2r, 17. 2v, 18; *-ôd-, merede* 2r, 16; *-ăt-, arzede* 1r, 6.

-isc-: *-isch, menischo* 2r, 25, *-e* 1r, 9. 1v, 28. vgl. 1r, 22 *mennisclichen*; dagegen *-sch, menschin* 1v, 23.

-lîch, verkürzt in *swelin* (< *swelên*) 1r, 16, Braune, § 292, Anm. 1.

-ang(ag) > *eg*: *honege* 1r, 26. 1v, 8. 2r, 5, 10, 20 (*Z.f.d.A.* 37, 124, Franck, § 63, 1; 51, 1).

-ig; *einvaldigemo* 1r, 29.

-al(ul), il > *el*: *quenelun* 1v, 10, *chumeles* 2r, 10, *nezelun* 2v, 36, *michel* 1r, 3, *leffela* 1v, 17. 2r, 15, *luzel* 2v, 4, 28.

-ar, -ur > *er*: *aderen* 1r, 17. 2v, 2, *vingerun* 1v, 2; *becherun* 1v, 18, *keiser* 1r, 2; *winstere* 1r, 10 (*winstrun* 2r, 34), *anderen* 1r, 18, *luder* 2r, 4, *wider* 1v, 8, *uber* 1r, 2, *peffer* 2r, 14.

-an > *en*: *gemolkena* 1v, 12, *zebrochenen* 1v, 30, *zesamene* 1v, 29, doch *geban* 1r, 6.

-ida > *-eda*: *siucheda* 1v, 15, *geblasede* 1r, 13. 2r, 21.

-it > *-et*: *hůbet* 1r, 1, 24, 27 etc.

-aha > *e*: *sale(widun)* 2v, 11.

-uh: *milche* 1v, 3, 11.

-iz: *curbiz* 2r, 28. *uz*: *hirzeshorn* 2v, 23.

-īn > *en*: *geizener* 1v, 3, *hulzen* 2v, 27, aber *chugine* 1v, 11.

-ist > *est*: *erest* 1r, 8. 2r, 36.

-a, -i, ŏ im absoluten Auslaut > *e*: *vone, obe(ove), ane, dafure, āne, diche, vile, salbe* (2v, 34), aber geblieben in *vilo* 1v, 2, *harto* 2r, 32 [! nebeneinander *vile harto*], *wola* 2v, 13.

Mehrmals erscheint *i*- Färbung des geschwächten Vokals (*ə*) in

Ableitungs- und Flexionssilben: *machint* 1v, 23, *heizzint* 1v, 26, 29, *menschin* 1v, 23, *magin* (dat.) 1v, 25, *zeginbonun* 2r, 1, *zelostin* 1v, 26, *heline* 2r, 9. 2v, 21. Über das Auftreten ahd. voller Vokale in den Kasus- und Personalendungen s. unter Flexion.

Westgerm. Sekundärvokal zwischen Liq. + Kons. ist nicht entwickelt, vgl. *uarua* 2r, 35.

Elision findet sich bei pronominaler Enclise: *ober* 1r, 17, 19. 2v, 20, *mischez* 1r, 26, *legez*, 1r, 27. 2r, 32, *nuzez* 2r, 21, *temperez* 2r, 31, *drucchez* 2v, 13, *drukenez* 2v, 33, aber Erhaltung des *-e* überwiegt: *newolde ez* 1r, 6, *lege ez* 1v, 15, *ove ime* 1r, 18, *mache ein* 2r, 4, 35. 2v, 24, *salbe ez* 2v, 29, 34, *sige ez* 2r, 13, *sage ez* 2v, 18, 25, *brenne ez* 2v, 25, *unze iz* 2v, 28.

Für Synkope eines Mittelvokals lässt sich hinweisen auf *eimo* 2v, 4, *emo* 2v, 8, *winstrun* 2r, 34, dagegen *einemo* 2v, 12, 15, *lucelemo* 2v, 4, *michelen crebesces* 2v, 31, *winstere* 1r, 10, sie ist also dem Schreiber nicht geläufig.

III. Vokale der Präfixe. Der geschwächte Vokal (*e*) herrscht durchaus, also *ge-*, *be*, *ze-* (*zelostin* 1v, 26), *er-* (*ersûchte*) 1r, 7, *ver-*.

C. Zur Wortbildung. Über die Ableitungen mit *-isc*, *-ida*, *-ĭn* etc. s. unter Mittelsilbenvokale. Hier sei noch hingewiesen auf das Deminutivsuffix *-în*: *gebundelin* 2v, 7, und das Doppelsuffix *-elechin* in *buchelechin* 1r, 1 (Weinhold, § 279). Zu *nivenes* 1v, 11, s. Kelle, *Otfried*, II, S. 377.

Zusammensetzungen: (*a*) *halsaderen* 1r, 17, *steinvarn* 1v, 20, *muterwrz* 2r, 29, *veltquenelun* 1v, 10. 2v, 3, *brustsweren* 2r, 2, *hôbetsweren* 1r, 8, 24, *persichkernen* 1r, 28, *aderlaze* 2v, 2, *luderdranc* 2r, 4, *trahheit* 1v, 28. (*b*) *stabewrt* 2r, 6, *salewidun* 2v, 11; *beneboumes* 2v, 7, *milzesweren* 2r, 35, *kinnebacchun* 2v, 30, *dillesamen* 2r, 18, *lanchesweren* 1v, 19, *-suhte* 2r, 24, *sîtesweren* 1v, 19 (O. Gröger, *Die althochdeutsche und altsächsische Kompositionsfuge*, 1911, § 58 *β*); *sittessweren* 2r, 23 (Schreibfehler, *sites-* bildet das Zeilenende), *herzesweren* 2r, 8 (Gröger, § 7 *a*), *wirnewines* 2r, 10 (wohl ältester Beleg dieser Zusammensetzung), *wildecurbiz* 2r, 28. (*c*) *hirzeshorn* 2v, 23, *eppheswrzelun* 2v, 4, *zeginbonun* 2r, 1, *arzebûch* (Züricher Text *arzinbôch*) 1r, 21, *berungallun* 2r, 31, *minzunsamen* 2r, 19.

D. Formenlehre. Ich führe die Wörter mit ahd. Vokalqualität der Endungen einzeln auf und füge in Klammern die Zahl der zu *-e* (resp. *-i*) geschwächten Endungen hinzu.

1. Deklination der Substantive.

(*a*) *a*-Stämme.

(*α*) Masculina: acc. plur. *daga* 1v, 17. 2v, 9, 14, *leffela* 1v, 17 (3 *-e*); dat. plur. *vingerun* 1v, 2.

(*β*) Neutra: acc. plur. *buchelechin* 1r, 1, *gebundelin* 2v, 7 [*bleter* 2, 36].

(*b*) *ja*-Stämme. Neutra: nom., acc. sgl., nom. plur. auf *-e*: *milze* 2r, 34, *ebehouwe* 1r, 24, *chinne* 1r, 13; dat. plur. *becherun* 1v, 18. Hieher zu setzen gen. sgl. *herzes* 1v, 9 (frühester Beleg!), vgl. Behaghel, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, § 383.

(*c*) *wa*-Stämme. Neutra: dat. sgl. *smere* 1v, 21.

(*d*) *ō*-Stämme: nom. sgl. *uarua* 2r, 35; gen. *quenelo* 2v, 3 (1 *-e*); acc. *siucheda* 1v, 15, *geblaseda* 2r, 21, *minza* 2r, 19, *claga* 1v, 9 (3 *-e*), *wis* 1r, 8. Dat. sgl. nur 2 auf *e*, dat. plur. 2 auf *-en*.

(*e*) Fem. in *-î*: acc. plur. *linsi* 1v, 9 (Zür. Text *linsine*, Franck, § 140, 2); dagegen nom. acc. sgl. auf *-e*: *suare* 1v, 16, *scarphe* 1v, 27.

(*f*) *i*-Stämme. Nur *e*- Formen bei allen Geschlechtern, z. B. *zene* 1r, 16, *milche* 1v, 3. Hieher gehört auch der dat. sgl. *bruste* 1r, 11, Weinhold, § 467, Belege aus Floire.

(*g*) *n*-Stämme.

(*α*) Masculina: nom. sgl. *menischo* 2r, 25 (3 auf *-e*); acc. sgl. *kinnebacchun* 2v, 30, (*site*)*sweron* 2r, 24, *postemon* 2r, 22 (11 auf *-en*); gen. sgl. *berun-* 2r, 31: die übrigen Kasus nur auf *-en*, resp. *-in*: *menschin* (n. pl.) 1v, 23, *magin* (dat. sgl.) 1v, 25.

(*β*) Feminina: gen. sgl. *salewidun* 2v, 11, *minzun* 2r, 19 (aber s. oben *d*), *lungun* 2v, 6, *bapelun* 2v, 35; dat. sgl. *erden* 1r, 25 (Zür. Text *erde*), *situn* 2r, 34, *wndun* 2v, 18, *pannun* 2r, 30. 2v, 26, *gallun* 2r, 31, *scinun* 2v, 26, *lungun* 2r, 23, *aderun* 2v, 2, *poleiun* 2r, 5, *sunnun* 2r, 30 (1 auf *-en*); acc. sgl. *quenelun* 1v, 10 (s. oben unter *d*), *pugnun* 2v, 18, *wndun* 2v, 19, 21 (dagegen *wnde* 2v, 16, Braune, § 208, 2), *mirrun* 2v, 22, *rindun* 2v, 11, *zeginbonun* 2r, 1, *rutun* 1r, 25. 2r, 3, 6, *nebetun* 2r, 18, *buccun* 2r, 29 (1 auf *-en*); acc. plur. *wrzelun* 2v, 4, *nezelun* 2v, 36.

(*γ*) Neutra. Nur acc. plur. *oren*; über *herzes* oben unter (*b*).

(*h*) Von anderen konsonant. Stämmen findet sich nur noch der dat. sgl. *manne* 1r, 12. 1v, 8, *niemanne* 1r, 6; zu *brust* s. unter (*f*).

2. Das Adjektivum.

(*a*) Flexionslose Formen.

(*α*) Masc.: *doub* 1r, 18, *warm* 2v, 33.

(*β*) Fem.: *gesoden* 1v, 10, *geniwen* 1v, 10/11, *bleich* 2r, 35, *mit dere diche geblasede* 1r, 13.

(*γ*) Neutra: *sîn* 1r, 1, *al* 1r, 25. 2r, 12, *nuze* 1v, 25, *wunderlich* 2v, 21, *hulzen* 2v, 27, *luzel* 2v, 28.

(*b*) Starke Flexion.

(*α*) Fem.: acc. sgl. *gemolkena* 1v, 11/12 sonst *-e*: *lawe* 1v, 12, *chugine*

1v, 11, *winstere* 1r, 10, *gepuluerede* 2r, 17, *wize* 2r, 19; gen. sgl. *geizener* 1v, 3; dat. sgl. *gelicher* 2r, 6/7; acc. plur. *druchene* 2v, 36.

(β) Neutra: dat. sgl. *einvaldigemo* 1r, 29, *lucelemo* 2v, 4; nom. pl. *beide* 1r, 13; acc. pl. *alle sine* 1r, 1, *dise alle* 2v, 31; gen. plur. *der allero gelich* 2v, 24.

(c) Schwache Flexion.

(α) Masc.: n. sgl. *vastendo* 1v, 12; acc. sgl. *damfedon* (*magen*) 2r, 22, sonst nur Formen auf *-en*: gen. sgl. *michelen* 2v, 31, *scarphen* 1r, 30; dat. sgl. *demo gewndeden* 2v, 20, *siechen* 2r, 4 u. ö., *virnen* 2v, 12, *niwen* 2r, 12. 2v, 8, *swerenden* 1v, 12, *gebostemoten* 2r, 15.

(β) Fem.: acc. sgl. *mittelun* 2v, 11; gen. *gemilwetun* 1v, 16; dat. *winstrun* 2r, 34, jedoch *fulenden* 2r, 23.

(γ) Neutra: acc. sgl. *daz wiza* 1v, 14, *gebranta* 2v, 29, aber *daz sich suínede* 1v, 8; dat. sgl. *mezlichen* 2r, 12, *alden* 1v, 21, *wizzen* 1r, 26; acc. plur. *zelostin* 1v, 26, *-en* 1v, 30, *gebrochenen* 1v, 30.

3. Das Pronomen.

(a) Das geschlechtige Pronomen der 3. Person.

(α) Masc. nom. *er* 1r, 4 u. ö.; acc. *in* 2v, 10, in der Enclise *nen* 1r, 3 (Franck, § 172, 3, Weinhold, § 476) und *-en* 1v, 21; dat. *imo* 1v, 3. 2r, 16. 2v, 2, 3, 5, *ime* 1r, 18. 2r, 9; gen. plur. *iro* 2r, 35.

(β) Fem. nom. *siu* 2v, 19 (einziger Beleg für diesen Kasus); acc. *sie* 2r, 2, 3, *si* 2v, 12; gen. sgl. *ire* 2r, 18.

(γ) Neut. nom. *iz* 2v, 28, sonst *ez*; *-et* 2r, 32 s. S. 208 unter (c) Dentale. Acc. *ez*, oft angelehnt *nuzez* 2r, 21 etc., *et* 2v, 26. Acc. plur. *si* 2r, 12, *sie* 2r, 7.

(b) Possessiv Pronomen. Belegt sind nur Formen von *sîn*; vgl unter Adjektiv Flexion.

(c) Das Demonstrativum.

(α) Masc. n. sgl. *der* 1r, 9 u. ö.; dat. *demo* 1r, 12, 14, 20, 24. 1v, 8, 11, 12, 14, 20, 25, 28. 2r, 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12, 15, 28, 35. 2v, 1, 9, 12, 19, *deme* 1r, 6.

(β) Fem. n. *diu* 2r, 9. 2v, 1, *die* 1v, 15, 16, *dise* 1r, 15; acc. *diu* 1v, 11 (Weinhold, § 483, Behaghel, § 414, 4), *di* 1r, 11, sonst *die*, *dise* 1r, 8; gen. *dero* 1v, 16, *dere* 2v, 3, 6, 11, *der* 2r, 23. 2v, 2, 35; dat. *dero* 2r, 4, 30. 2v, 6, 18, 25, 26, *dere* 1r, 11, 13. 2r, 24, 31, *der* 1r, 25. 2r, 30, 34. 2v, 2, *derre* 2r, 25; dat. pl. *din* 1r, 18.

(γ) Neut. n. *diz* 2v, 21; acc. *diz* 1v, 22. 2v, 15, 19; dat. *demo* 1r, 9, 26, 29. 1v, 7, 21. 2r, 12. 2v, 13, 34; acc. pl. *die* 1r, 13, 16. 2r, 20, *dise* 2v, 31. Gen. pl. *der* 2v, 24.

(d) *selb.* acc. sgl. n. *selbe* (hinter *diz*) 1v, 22. 2v, 19.

(*e*) Relativum. Zumeist ausgedrückt durch Demonstrat. + Partikel *der* (*dir* 2r, 24, 27) z. B. 1r, 12, 22; seltener durch das blosse Demonstrat.: *daz* 1r, 21. 1v, 13. 2r, 28 (doch folgt beidemal die Partikel *da*); *demo* 2v, 14. Ausserdem das Indefinit. *swelin* 1r, 16.

4. Zahlwörter. (*a*) Cardinalzahlen: acc. masc. *zwene* 2r, 15, 26, *dri* 1v, 17. 2r, 16. 2v, 14, *nun* 1v, 4, 17; acc. n. *zwei* 2r, 9, *zue* 2r, 13, *driu* 2v, 6, 8; dat. *drin* 1v, 2, 18. (*b*) Ordinalzahlen: *daz andera—drita—vierda —funfta* 1v, 5, 6, 7—*dritten* 2v, 13.

5. Adverbia: *vilo* 1v, 2 (*vile* 1v, 18), *harto* 2r, 32, *wola* 2v, 13; *erest* 1r, 8, *aller erest* 2r, 36. 2v, 33; *nivenes* 1v, 11, *inwertes* 2r, 24; *fure* 1v, 31, *dan* (< *dannen*) *uz* 2r, 31, *dar inne* 1r, 4, aber *da inne* 1r, 3, *dare zu* 1r, 30 und *dar zu* 2r, 14, *dar ane* 1r, 8. 2v, 15, 25, *dar ubere* 2v, 36, *da mide* 2v, 29; *abe* 1v, 15.

6. Praepositionen: *vone* 1v, 20. 2r, 8; *zu* 2r, 12 neben *ze*; *biz ze* 2v, 13, *ingegen* c. dat. 2r, 23, c. acc. 2v, 16 (Weinhold, § 335), *wider* c. acc. 2r, 21, 22, 23, *vor* c. acc. 2r, 22.

7. Konjunktionen: neben *oder* 1r, 29 u. ö., einmal *ove* 1r, 19. Weinhold, § 331; E. Sievers, *Oxforder Benedictinerregel*, p. ix; J. Meier, *Jolande*, p. xvii (allgemeinrheinische Form). *joch* 1v, 9. 2r, 5, 7, 18, 22, 24. 2v, 6, *unze* 2v, 28 (*biz* übergeschrieben und dies auch 2r, 13. 2v, 26), *unde* die gewöhnliche Schreibung vor Kons. und Vok., doch *un* 2r, 23. 2v, 29. 2v, 7, *vn* 2v, 8, 28 in allen Fällen ausser 2r, 23 am Zeilenschluss, was kaum Zufall sein wird.

8. Flexion des Zeitwortes.

(*a*) Starke Verba. Folgende Formen sind erwähnenswert: inf. *geban* 1r, 6, sonst *-en* z. B. *nemen* 1v, 5. Imp. *sige* 2r, 13 (Weinhold, § 371), *wasche* 2v, 32, im übrigen die endungslose Form: *heiz, nim, siut* (*siud*), *laz, bint*, etc., vgl. noch *niv* 1r, 25, 28, *niw(ez)* 1v, 14, *niw(en)* 1v, 21. 2. pers. sgl. ind. *lazest* 2v, 2. 3. pers. sgl. ind. *swirit* 2r, 34. 2v, 14, sonst *-et*: *stirbet* 1r, 11, *kumet* 2r, 8, *spiet* 2v, 20, *nimet* 1v, 15 also durchaus die unsynkopierte Form. 3. pers. plur. ind. auf *-ent*: *swerent* 1r, 17, *heizent* 1v, 25, *-int*: *heizzint* 1v, 27, 29. 3. pers. sgl. conj. *verbrinne* 2v, 26 [das schwache *brenne* imp. 2v, 25]. Part. perf. *gesoden* 1v, 10, *geniven* (= *geniuwen*) 1v, 10/11, vgl. Z *genuwen*; zur Form Paul, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 159, Anm. 2.

(*b*) Schwache Verba. Die Klassenunterschiede sind fast ganz verwischt, Spuren nur in zwei Lehnwörtern: inf. *pulverun* 2v, 32 (*Beiträge*, 7, 558) und *gebostemoten* 2r, 15. Einzelnes: 3. pers. sgl. ind. **bluet* 1r, 25, *leget* 1r, 11, *iuchet* 1r, 11. 3. pers. plur. ind. *-ent*; einmal *-en*: *lihten* 1v, 27 vielleicht Sandhi-Schreibung vor folgendem *d-*; *-int*:

machint 1^{v}, 23. Imp. *sâge* 2^{v}, 18, 25 (*seie* übergeschrieben), *saige* 2^{v}, 35; *salbe* 2^{v}, 29, 34. Part. perf. *zelostin* 1^{v}, 26, 30, *gebranta* 2^{v}, 29, *versucht* 1^{v}, 4; *gemilwetun* 1^{v}, 26, *gepuluerete* 2^{v}, 18, 2^{r}, 17, *gewndeden* 2^{v}, 20, *gebostemoten* 2^{r}, 15; *haben* zeigt nur die vollen Formen: *habet* 1^{r}, 9, 15, 21. 2^{r}, 25, *habent* 2^{r}, 25, *gehaben* 1^{v}, 2.

Anm. 1. Das Gerundium: der dat., die allein vorkommende Form, endet bei den starken wie bei den schwachen Verben auf *-ene* (*-ine*): *zedrinkene* 1^{v}, 4, 18 u. ö., *zeholene* 1^{v}, 20, *zeheline* 2^{r}, 9, *zesterkene* 2^{r}, 17.

Anm. 2. Das part. pres. endet auf *-ende*: *swerenden* 1^{v}, 12, *fulenden* 2^{r}, 23, aber mit *n*-Ausfall; auf *-ede*: *swinede* 1^{v}, 8, *damfedon* 2^{r}, 22. *Z. f. d. A.*, 37, 124–27.

(*c*) Praeteritopraesentia: (*du*) *salt* 1^{v}, 5, 7. 2^{v}, 31; *mach* 1^{r}, 14, *mugen* (3. pers. pl. ind.) 1^{r}, 22. 2^{r}, 27, *mugist* (conj.) 1^{v}, 2.

(*d*) Verbum substantivum: 3. sgl. *ist* 1^{r}, 17 u. ö.; 3. pl. *sint* 1^{v}, 25. Conj. 3. sgl. *si* 1^{r}, 18, *sie* 2^{v}, 33; *were* 1^{r}, 3, *neware* 1^{r}, 6.

(*e*) Die Verba *tuon, stân, gân, wollen*: *du* imp. 1^{r}, 29 u. ö.; 3. sgl. *bestet* 2^{r}, 8, *get* 2^{v}, 17, dagegen inf. *gan* 2^{r}, 16, *ergan* 2^{v}, 10 Formen, die der Vorlage zu zuweisen sind. 2. sgl. Conj. *wollest* 2^{v}, 15; 3. sgl. *wolle* 2^{r}, 16 (Braune, § 385, Anm. 4).

Aus diesen Zusammenstellungen ergibt sich: Unsere Bruchstücke (B) weisen zwei dialektisch gesonderte Sprachschichten auf. Die jüngere d. h. die Sprache des Schreibers deutet auf rheinfränkisches Gebiet—s. besonders die Stellung der Labialen und Dentalen, die Formen *ove* (Konj.), *buchelechin, wollest, wolle*; die ndd. Spuren unverschobener dentaler Tenuis (*wrt* und zweimal *et*) dürften in individueller Sprachmischung des Schreibers ihre Erklärung finden und höchstens, zusammen mit dem Übergang von *uo* > *ū*(*ō*) und *ĭ* > *e*, vgl. auch *swe* 1^{r}, 3, für den nördlichen Teil Rheinfrankens als Heimat sprechen. An ndd. Einsprengungen, die man nicht einem besonderen Abschreiber zuzurechnen braucht, fehlt es in Denkmälern aus diesem Gebiet auch in der älteren Zeit nicht, und zwar nicht nur in Glossen; vgl. z. B. *Beiträge*, 27, 534 f.; 38, 341 f. (gegen meine dort ausgesprochene Ansicht).

Die ältere Schicht d. h. die Sprache der Vorlage zeugt für Alemannien, —s. die *ch-, -cch-, -f-* in *damfedon*, die vereinzelten *siu, diu* neben *sie, die, druchene* (2^{v}, 36), die Form *swelin* (< *swelên*) 1^{r}, 16; ihr gehören natürlich auch die Formen mit erhaltenen ahd. Flexionsvokalen an und ihr Stand in seiner Gesamtheit scheint da doch noch auf das 11. Jh. als Entstehungszeit der Vorlage, resp. der Übersetzung dieser medicinischen Traktate zu führen.

Was das Verhältnis von B zu Z betrifft, so ist Z aus palæographischen

wie lautlichen Gründen die jüngere Fassung, aber sie kann nicht aus dem Codex, dem B angehörte, abgeschrieben worden sein. Abgesehen von einzelnen Plus und Minus bald auf der einen, bald auf der anderen Seite, schliesst dies schon die Beobachtung aus, dass in B die lateinischen Recept-Überschriften, die zudem, so weit sie sich finden, nur selten mit Z wörtlich übereinkommen, meist verdeutscht sind, und hierin Formen vorkommen, die dem älteren Lautstand der Vorlage (B*) angehören, z. B.: B 1^{v}, 19 f. *Ad sagitta*[*m*]. *Daz gefcoz ze holene uone demo liebe,* Z 146 nur: *Ad sagittam eiciendam.* B 2^{v}, 17 f. *Ad uulnus fanandum. Ze dero wndun. Nim...,* Z 152 *Ad uulnera. Nim...,* oder gar: B 2^{v}, 21 *Diz ift ein wnderlich puluer ze heline die wndun. Nim mirrun...,* Z 155 *Ad sananda grauia uulnera. Nim mirram....* Wir müssten also für eine gemeinsame Vorlage von B u. Z auf einen Archetypus X (B → B* → X) zurückgreifen und dann noch B* und Z (resp. Z*) ziemliche Selbständigkeit in der Auswahl und Einzelgestaltung des von X gebotenen zutrauen. Eine andere Möglichkeit wäre, B und Z als Niederschläge zweier auf alemannischem Boden vorgenommener Übersetzungsversuche desselben medicinischen Traktats (des Arzneibuchs Hypokratis[1]) zu betrachten, zu dem B* noch andere—wir können ihren Umfang nicht mehr bestimmen—hinzufügte. Für die oft sehr weitgehende Übereinstimmung im Wortlaut wäre dann die Natur des Originals verantwortlich zu machen.

Ich gebe nun den Text im diplomatischen Abdruck, nur habe ich unleserliche Buchstaben, wo die Ergänzung gesichert schien, zwischen eckige Klammern gesetzt.

[1] Die einheitliche lateinisch Vorlage ist noch nicht gefunden, doch haben sich, nach brieflicher Mitteilung F. Wilhelms, in medicinischen Handschriften, an ganz verschiedenen Stellen zerstreut, die meisten Recepte erhalten.

1r .....

Dalle ſine buchelechin in ſin grab under ſin hûbet
Dar nach uber lanch fuor ein keiſer dafure. unde
uerwande nen daz m[ic]hel scaz da inne were. D[o]
hiez er daz grab of[enen] unde uuan: a dar inne ein
5 bûch alle ſin arz[ed]ie. do nam er daz bûch unde
newolde [e]z niemanne [g]eban neware deme arzede PRO
[AM]ODOSIO. Do er daz bûch erſûchte. do vant er aller
ereſt dar ane [vm]be den hŏbet ſweren in diſe wis. **S**ue
der menniſche habet den ſwe[r]en unde die gefwſt in demo
10 antlizze ane den huſten unde ob er die winstere hant dich[e]
leget zu dere bruſte. unde ob er di naſe diche ſuchet. ſo ſtir
bet er in demo XXIII. da[ge.] Sue dem[o] manne der der iſt
frenetícus. rodent beide d[ie] chinne mit dere diche gebl[a]
ſede. unde niwit uerd[owen] mach. so ſtirbet er in demo
15 VIIII. dage. Diſe paſſio habet vile dieche die calden ſudo
reſ. unde die kalden oren ioch die kalden zene. **S**ue
lin ſwerent die half aderen. unde ob er iſt alſo der dou[b]
mit
si. unde ove ime wirret der wize vleche ove din anderen
[ſa]chen. unde ober geret deſ warmen badeſ ove ſwe[i]zeſ. ſ[o]
20 ſtirbet er in demo. L. dage. **Incipit liber ypocratis** 20 (Incipit)–30: F. Wilhelm, *Denkmäler deutscher Prosa*, XXV, Zeile 1–12.

HZ i[e] beginnet daz arzebûch ypocratiſ daz habet ge
ſcriben allen den ſuhten die der mugen erwaſſen in
allen den menniſclichen liden. **Ad dolorē capitis**
e demo hovbet ſweren [n]im vermude. ebehouwe. daz

1 *Ergänze vorher nach der Baseler Hs.* B. XI. 8 (*oben S.* 205) *etwa*: (D)o ypocras der arzet sterben solde. do hiez er legen. 4 uuan: a] *l.* vand da. 5 bûch alle] *ist dazwischen ein* unde *ausgefallen? oder:* aller ſiner? 9 gefwſt] *l.* gefwlft. 13 chinne] *l.* chnie. diche] *aus* duhe *korr.* 22 geſcriben] *dahinter* wider *zu ergänzen.*

Quelle zu Z. 1–20; *s. oben S.* 206, *Absatz* 2: Peritissimus omnium domestica sapientia in omnibus corporibus iusserat Yppocrates ut] in sepulcro suo poneretur sub capite ipsius analogius. positus erat, ubi corpus Yppocratis iacebat. et transit inde Cesar post multum tempus. et vidit monumentum et putavit in eo esse thesaurum. iussit illud aperire secretim. et invenit analogium sub capite illius positum, ubi omnia secreta artis medicine erant. tulit et nulli iussit dari nisi medico Proamodosio quo scrutato invenerunt ibi primum ad capitis dolorem. Si habuerit dolorem vel tumorem in facie sine tusse et si sinistram manum tenuerit ad pectus et si sibi nares assidue scalpit. XXIII die morietur. Item freneticus. si amba genua rubea habuerit solida cum inflatione et non digestione stomachi, in nono die morietur. Hec ualitudo incipit habere sudores frigidos, aures frigidas, dentes frigidas. si in labore fuerint in collo veneque sunt extense. et si quasi surdus fuerit et si papulas super ipsas venas habuerit, ubi una alba nata fuerit, et si in egritudine vaporem aut lavacrum desideraverit calidum in. L. die morietur.

ander erden vluet. rutun. unde niv ez al zefamene. vnde mifchez mit honege. unde demo wizzen def eief. unde legez an ein d[uch] unde verbint. daz hovbet mide. **N**im die perf[ich ker]nen. unde niv fie mit oleo rofeato. oder mit de[mo ein]valdigemo oleo. unde du daz halbe deil def scarphen ezzigef dare zu. unde fal

1ᵛ .....

so uilo sv du mit drin uingerun gehaben mugift. unde mifche dare zu ein mez geizener milche. unde gib imo nun dage zedrinkene. ez ift uerfucht. **Ad ficum.** Ov salt nemen ein gewith. cariofilef. daz andera cina momi. daz drita pip. daz uierda gingeberneſ. daz funfta cumini. unde salt ez zedriben mit demo niven honege. unde gib ez wider daz fich fuínede demo mane. **Ad ſt[õ] def 7 c[or]** Wider magen ioch def herzef claga. salt du linfi ezzen mit ezzige gefoden. oder drinken die velt quenelun ge niven mit demo wine oder diu chugine milch nivenef ge molkena lawe vaftendo. daz ift vile gut ze demo fweren den magen. **Ad ſtõ** Nim def pulueref daz man da machet uzer demo maftice. unde daz wiza def eief. unde niwez ze famene. unde lege ez uber den magen. ez nimet abe die fiu cheda. unde die fuared ef magen **Ad ilia** Nim dero gemilwe tun centaurie nun leffela uol. unde gib imo dri daga ze drinkene. mit drin becherun winef. ez ift ouch uile gut uor den fite fweren. unde uor den lanche fweren. **Adsagitta[m]** Daz gefcoz zeholene uone demo liebe. Nim den ftein varn unde niwen mit demo alden fmere. unde bint den uber die wnden fo get daz gefcoz uz. Obe du wilt diz felbe dinc uerfuchen fo bint ez ander* der machint daz die menf chin uer dowent mit genaden daz fie nuzent. Customa

4 (Ad ficum)–8 (honege): Wilhelm, Z. 129–32.

9–13: Wilhelm, Z. 133–37.

16–19: Wilhelm, Z. 143–46.

19–23 (ander) *und* 2ᵛ, 16 (halb)–17: Wilhelm, Z. 146–51.

1ʳ: 25 vluet] *l.* bluet?

1ᵛ: 1 *Gegen Ende der Zeile sind noch ein paar untere Buchstabenschäfte sichtbar.* 8 *Es fragt sich, ob der Satz* unde—manne *ursprünglich hieher gehört, vgl. den Züricher Text.* 9 *Das übergeschriebene* def *rot.* 14 ze] -e *unsicher.* 23 ander*] *über das Abbrechen des Textes und seine Wiederaufnahme* 2ᵛ 16 *halb *vgl. oben S.* 206, *Absatz* 2. 24 do went.

Quelle zu Z. 23 der machint—*Z.* 31 (*s. oben S.* 205 f., *Absatz* 2): Sunt autem genera nominum effectum eorum hęc: Innoctica, quę somnum vel soporem faciunt. Pecticas], quę digestionem faciunt. Customathas apta stomacho. Stipticas, quę

demo
cha heizent die der nuze ſint magin. Stipica heizent die der betwingent die zeloſtin deil. Lia heizzint die der ſemf te ſint. unde die der lihten die scarphe. Obrectica heizzint die der nement demo mennifchen die trahheit unde die ungeluſt. Collectica heizzint die der zeſamene weillent unde gebindent die zebrochenen unde die zeloſten. Dio retica heizent die der fure bringent die urinā. Catartica

2r De eodē. Siut die zegin' bonū mit demo ezzige. unde bint ſie uber die druſe. **Ad pectoriſ doloř.** Ze demo bruſt ſweren ſiud die rutun mit demo wine. unde gib ſie kedrin kene demo ſiechen. **Itē.** Mache ein luder dranc mit de ro poleiun. ioch mit demo honege. unde gib ez zedrin kene. **Itē.** Nim die rutun. marrubium. ſtabewrt mit ge licher maze. unde niu ſie. ioch gib ſie demo ſiechen ze

demo
drinkene. kumet ez ouch uone herzeſweren ſo beſtet ime diu ſiecheit. Die poſtema zeheline nim zwei mez deſ honegeſ. ein deil deſ chumeleſ. deſ wirnewineſ ein deil. marrubium ein deil. feniculi ein deil. unde ſiud ſi al zeſamene in demo niwen habene zu demo mezli chen viure. biz ez werde zue mez. dar nach ſo ſige ez durch ein duch. unde miſche dar zu den peffer. unde gib ez demo geboſtemoten ſo er uaſte zuene leffele ze

after merede
drinkene. ſo er ſlafen wolle gan so gib imo dri zedrinkene.

Ze den magen zeſterkene nim die gepuluerede **Ad ſtomachū.** nebetun ioch ire ſamen. unde deſ epphef ſamen. dille ſa men. minzun ſamen. poleium. cuminū die wize minza. unde niv die zeſamene. unde du darzu honec. unde ze dribez zelectuarium. unde nuzez wider geblaſeda deſ

1–2: Wilhelm, Z. 112–13.
2–9: Wilhelm, Z. 114–21.
9–16: Wilhelm, Z. 122–28.

2r: 18 nebetun] *i.e.* nepita 'Katzenminze,' *Ahd. Glossen*, III, 577, 27; sigeminze, 580, 20.

stringunt partes relaxatas. Lias lenia, quę liniunt asperitudinem. Obtrecticas sunt, quę fastidium auferunt. Collecticas glutinatoria, quę omnia soluta vel fluxa gluttinant, alligant. Dioreticas, quę urinam provocant. Catarticas, [quę ventrem vel vulvera solvent et purgant].

magen. unde uor den damfedon. ioch wider den postemon. unde in gegen der fulenden lungun. un wider den fitef fweron. ioch ze dere lanke fuhte die dir inwertef der menifcho habet. Dieder derre fuhte iwet habent. den gib zwene leffele uol fo fie uaftent. unde gib ez ouch den die dir niwet ezzen. noch dowen ne mugen **Aduentrif dol**[oř]

Ze demo buche nim daz da—heizzet wilde curbiz unde muter wrz. ioch die buccun. unde derre fie in der pannun. oder zedero funnun. unde mache ein puluer dan uz unde temperez mit dere berun gallun. unde legez uber den nabel. so uegetet uile harto den

Die heizent splenetici den der **Ad fplenif dolorē**. [buch daz milze fwirit. daz der liget in der winftrun fitun. unde iro uarua ift bleich. Zedemo milze fweren mache aller ereft embrocaf mit difen dingen mit wermoden

2v ren diu zu demo milze get alfo da gefcriben ift in demo briue der aderlaze. So du imo lazeft in der aderun. so gib imo drinken daz saf dere uelt quenelo. unde tempe epphef wrzelun mit eimo lucelemo deile def ezzigef. unde def honegef. unde gib ez imo ezzen oder drinken.

Ze dero heilunge def milzef. ioch dere lungun. nim driu **Itē** gebundelin marrubii unde vlieht def beneboumef. un dri u mez def winef. unde fiud ez in emo niwen havene. vn laz ez erkulen. unde gib ez demo fiechen dri daga fo er va fte. unde heiz in fich er gan dar nach. **Itēm ad fplen**

Nim die mittelun rindun dere fale widun eine hant vol unde siud si in einemo niuen havene mit demo uirnen wine biz zedemo dritten deil^{e} unde drucchez uile wola uz unde gib ez dri daga demo daz milze fuuirit. Obe du diz dar ane wolleft verfuchen. fo gib ez einemo fuuíne ze drinkene under* halb in gegen die wnde. daz scoz get dar uz. **Ad uulnuf fanandum**

Ze dero wndun. Nim die gepuluerete pugnū. unde fage

17–19 (siu): Wilhelm, Z. 152–54.

2r: 29 buccun] *i.e.* artemisia, *Ahd. Glossen*, III, 577 *Anm.* 15. 31 berun gallun] *Bärengalle.* 36 dingen—wermoden] *der Schnitt geht mitten durch die Buchstabenschäfte.*
2v: 18 pugnū]=bungun, *i.e.* barula '*eine kressenartige Pflanze*,' *s. Ahd. Glossen*, III, 577 *Anm.* 15 *und* 537, 17 *oder* bulbus '*Zwiebel*' *ibid.* 471, 16.

ez uber die wndun. so heilet síu. Diz selbe crut gib de
mo gewndeden drinken. ob er ez spiet so ſtirbet er.

Diz iſt ein wnderlich puluer ze heline die wndun. **Item** Nim mirrun. wiroch. maſtice. harz pech. orgement. hal galia. aloe. gibs. hirzef horn. die ariſtolotia rotunda. du der allero gelich. unde mache ein puluer dan uz. unde ſeie ſage ez dar ane. **Itē** Nim bli unde brenne ez in dero pannun. unde zedribet mit dero ſcinun. biz ez verbrinne. unde du ez danne in ein hulzen vaz. unde du dare zu ein luzel oleief unde ezzigef. unde unze iz biz ez wiz werde. vn salbe ez da mide. **De eadē re** Nim daz gebranta bli un de attramtū. pip. peretrū. def hecchedef kinnebac chun. def michelen crebefcef bein. Difе alle falt du we gen gelich. unde puluerun. unde wafche die ſtat mit wine deder r warm ſie aller ereſt. unde drukenez mit demo duche. unde falbe ez mit demo honege. dar nah ſ[o ſ]aige daz p[uluer] dar ane. unde lege der bapelun [bleter.] oder druchene nezelun dar ubere. **Ad urine.**

21–25: Wilhelm, Z. 155–59.

25–29: Wilhelm, Z. 160–63.

29–36: Wilhelm, Z. 164 (*Überschrift*: Ad cancrum!) –172.

36 Ad urine: Wilhelm, Z. 181 Ad difficultatem urinę.

2ᵛ: 28 *Ergänze zwischen* unde *und* unze *ein* zedribez (*vgl.* Z).

Robert Priebsch.

London.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus.

In his edition of a homily from the margin of Corpus Christi College, MS. 41 (formerly 2), pp. 295–301, in *Modern Philology*, I ('The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus,' pp. 579–614), William H. Hulme prints the following passage on p. 612 (34): 'þa deman and ða ealdormen þenu earmra manna æhta nidinga nimað and gegripað [and] his worc cettaþ and hate eþiað and fnæstniað.' As it stands, the passage is devoid of sense, and Hulme's introduction of 'and' is by no means an improvement. I propose to read: 'þa deman and ða ealdormen þe nu earmra manna æhta nidinga nimað and gegripað, hi sworettaþ and hate eþiað and fnæstniað.'

A. E. H. Swaen.

Amsterdam.

Marlowe and Lucian.

I do not know if it has been pointed out before that the famous line in Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, xiii, 91,

> Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships,

may have been suggested by a passage in the *Dialogues of the Dead* of Lucian (18), in which Menippos asks Hermes to show him the fair ones of olden times:

MEN. Ὅμως τὴν Ἑλένην μοι δεῖξον· οὐ γὰρ ἂν διαγνοίην ἔγωγε.

EPM. Τουτὶ τὸ κρανίον ἡ Ἑλένη ἐστίν.

MEN. Εἶτα διὰ τοῦτο αἱ χίλιαι νῆες ἐπληρώθησαν ἐξ ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τοσοῦτοι ἔπεσον Ἕλληνές τε καὶ βάρβαροι καὶ τοσαῦται πόλεις ἀνάστατοι γεγόνασιν;

Cf. 2 *Tamburlaine*, ii, 4:

> Helen, whose beauty summoned Greece to arms,
> And drew a thousand ships on Tenedos.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

SHAKESPEARE, 'ROMEO AND JULIET,' II, ii, 38 ff.

The text of the first folio is as follows:

> 'Tis but thy name that is my Enemy:
> Thou art thy selfe, though not a *Mountague*,
> What's *Mountague*? it is nor hand nor foote,
> Nor arme, nor face, O be some other name
> Belonging to a man.
> What? in a names that which we call a Rose,
> By any other word would smell as sweete, etc.

In this text (apart from the misprints in the last line but one) the quartos, after the first, and the folios are agreed. The first quarto has:

> Tis but thy name that is mine enemie.
> Whats *Mountague*? It is nor hand nor foote,
> Nor arme, nor face, nor any other part.
> Whats in a name? That which we call a Rose,
> By any other name would smell as sweet, etc.

Modern editors read (after the first three lines of the folio text):

> Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
> Belonging to a man. O, be some other name!
> What's in a name? That which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet, etc.

But I suspect that another correction is required. The line:

> Thou art thyself, though not a Montague,

is felt by all editors to be a difficulty, standing where it does. It interrupts the course of Juliet's reflections and anticipates in an awkward manner the idea which comes later of parting with the name. It was meant, I suspect, to follow the words 'O, be some other name!' and here it is quite in place and needs no elaborate explanation. The line is an addition made to the text of the first quarto, and so also is the exclamation just cited. The latter has admittedly been inserted in the wrong place, and it is probable that the same is the case with the line to which I refer.

The first quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* gives a considerably shorter text of the play than the later quartos and the folios, but it must be regarded as representing a genuine early form, which was afterwards enlarged and revised. The passages which are wanting in it are mostly such as can be spared, while the text on the whole is fairly sound, and supplies a considerable number of good readings. Especially it is to be noted that the general correctness of the verse arrangement forbids us to suppose that it was taken down from a stage performance. In

several other passages, besides this to which I am calling attention, additions seem to have been inserted in the wrong place, *e.g.* I, ii, 67—69, where the lines:

> Her chariot is an empty hazel-nut, etc.

are an addition to the text of the first quarto, and might more appropriately precede the description of the details, ll. 59—66. Or again III, iii, 40 ff., where the first quarto has:

> But *Romeo* may not, he is banished,
> Flies may doo this, but I from this must flye.

developed by the second quarto into:

> This may flyes do, when I from this must flie,
> And sayest thou yet, that exile is not death?
> But *Romeo* may not, he is banished.
> Flies may do this, but I from this must flie:
> They are freemen, but I am banished,

and in the first folio given thus:

> This may Flies doe, when I from this must flie,
> And saist thou yet, that exile is not death?
> But *Romeo* may not, hee is banished.

Here obviously there has been a disarrangement of some kind, and the line 'And sayest thou yet that exile is not death?' has been wrongly placed, not to mention the repetition which appears in the second and subsequent quartos.

A somewhat similar case occurs in *Richard the Third*, I, iv, 264 ff. (Globe edition), where the addition of some lines in the folio to the text of the quartos is accompanied by a disarrangement of the order.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

'A dry beating.'

This is an expression which still survives colloquially and provincially, apparently meaning 'a sound beating.' This use of 'dry' has not, I think, been satisfactorily explained. It is frequent in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in connexion with 'beating,' 'blows' etc. In Shakespeare we have, *Comedy of Errors*, II, ii, 65, 'Lest it make you choleric and purchase me another dry basting,' as well as the verb 'dry-beat' in *Rom. and Juliet*, III, i, 84,

and elsewhere. The explanation given in the *Oxford Dictionary* is, 'properly, That does not draw blood (as a blow given with a stick or the fist, which merely causes a bruise); by some app. used vaguely, = Hard, stiff, severe.' This last is in fact the regular meaning, and the idea of blows that do not draw blood seems to be imported to account for the use of the word.

But surely it is unscientific to refuse to identify the phrase in question with similar expressions in Middle English, in which there is no question at all of dry as opposed to moist. In *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, for example, we have, l. 1460,

> Bot quen þe dyntez him dered of her dryȝe strokez,

and l. 2263 (of a blow),

> Hade hit driuen adoun as dreȝ as he atled.

Also *Rowland and Otuel*, 696 (quoted in the *N. E. D. s.v.* 'dree'):

> His dynttes were full dreghe.

This word is common in M.E. in various connexions, meaning 'mighty' or 'fierce,' as well as 'enduring,' 'persistent,' 'difficult,' and is connected of course with the stem of O.E. 'dréogan.' In the Modern English phrases to which reference has been made, 'dry' no doubt represents this word, and means properly 'hard' or 'severe,' though some of those who used the expressions misunderstood them, interpreting 'dry,' not indeed in the sense suggested by the *N. E. D.*, but after the analogy of 'dry bread,' to refer to the absence of satisfaction to the sufferer in the process, as in the quotation from the *Daily Post* of May 24, 1731, given in the *Mod. Language Review*, vol. viii, p. 171: 'Wherein several Loggerheads will go near to be broken, and the Best come off with dry blows': or in such an expression as I have heard used in reference to a dog: 'He got nothing by it but a dry beating.'

In the passage quoted from the *Comedy of Errors*, there is a play upon the two meanings of this word, as well as of 'basting.'

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Two Unnoticed Poems probably written by Pierre Corneille.

The two following poems, signed 'P.C.,' are found in the introductory pages to *La Melize pastorale comique par le Sieur du Rocher*, Paris, 1634[1]:

Au Sieur du Rocher.

Au point ou l'on vois [sic] tes escrits
Ie croy que tous les beaux esprits,
Seront charmez de tes merueilles,
Et l'on peut iuger aysement,
Qu'il n'est point de contentement,
Apres le doux fruict de tes veilles.

P.C.

Les Poetes a Monsieur du Rocher, sur ces Princes recognus.

De quelle assez digne louange,
Peut on honorer tes escris
Puisqu'on les reconnoist sans pris,
Et digne mil[le] fois de l'estime d'un Ange:
Au dessein de loüer un esprit si parfaict
Tous nos desirs n'ont point d'effect,
Icy nostre puissance à [sic] trouué des limites,
Mais quoy tes soings seront mieux recongus [sic],
Puisque ces Princes Inconus [sic],
Vont publier pour nous ta gloire et tes merites.

P.C.

Corneille is more likely to have been the author of these lines than any of his contemporaries with the same initials. Between 1631 and 1635 he wrote four similar poems to Scudéry, Mareschal, and La Pinelière[2], authors who, at the time they received his praises, were scarcely better known than this obscure Du Rocher. Although he ordinarily signed himself 'Corneille,' he has left an example of the 'P.C.' signature at the end of a poem published in the *Mercure galant* for March 7, 1680[3]. His praise of Du Rocher is no more absurd than that which he gave to Mareschal and La Pinelière, or than that which he lavished upon Boisrobert, whose mention of him in an Epistle will, he assures the grotesque abbé, bring him greater fame than *Cinna*, *Rodogune*, the *Cid*, and *Horace*[4]. Finally, the device, found in the second poem, of referring to characters in the play praised recurs in Corneille's complimentary verses to other dramatists.

[1] Privilege, February 3.
[2] Cf. Marty-Laveaux, *Œuvres de P. Corneille*, x, pp. 57, 61, 62, 73.
[3] *Op. cit.*, x, p. 334. The editor of the journal states that the poem was written by Pierre Corneille.
[4] *Op. cit.*, x, p. 103.

None of these facts, of course, proves that Corneille wrote the verses, but they do show that there is nothing improbable in assigning to him their authorship. On the other hand, I can find no name that fits the initials so well as his. It is true that a score of men of this period can be mentioned who had similar initials, but they were, for the most part, theologians, like Pierre Champeil or Philippe Codurc, jurists, like Pierre Canon or Philippe Cothereau, an artist, Philippe de Champagne, a diplomat, Pierre Chanut, a physician, Philippe Colot. The only men of letters I find are Jean-Pierre Camus, Prudent Constant, Pierre Costar, Pierre de Caseneuve, none of whom was a dramatist, only one a poet, and Pierre de Cotignon Sieur de La Charnaye, who was, indeed, both poet and dramatist, but whose name seems hard to reduce to a simple 'P.C.'

Moreover, Corneille was already a well-known dramatist, the author by the year 1634 of six plays recognized by his contemporaries as among the most important of the period. Introductory poems in praise of plays were usually written by dramatists. Hence the initials in question, attached to poems addressed to a playwright, would so readily be attributed to Corneille that their use by another would seem almost a forgery. It is therefore highly probable that the poems were written by Corneille.

Is it to be argued from this conclusion and from the fact that Du Rocher[1], like Mareschal and Scudéry, devoted his plays largely to setting forth impossible romantic adventures, that Corneille had at this time a special admiration for that kind of drama? I think not, for by 1634 he had himself written five comedies of manners and only one tragi-comedy, and, since his contemporaries published only plays of the latter type or equally romantic pastorals and comedies, he was obliged, in order to praise any other plays than his own, to turn to the work of such men as Scudéry and Du Rocher. Later, the popularity of introductory verses waned, so that it is not surprising to find that these romantic plays are almost the only ones favoured by Corneille with praise. It is probable that in such verses he is not stating a genuine opinion, but is merely using a conventional means of expressing his friendship for certain of his contemporary dramatists.

H. Carrington Lancaster.

Amherst, Mass., U.S.A.

[1] The only thing known about this author, besides his writing *Melize*, is the fact that he composed a tragi-comedy called *l'Indienne amoureuse ou l'heureux naufrage* (privilege, June 14, 1631), in which he adorns a subject taken from Ariosto with all the conceits and extravagances familiar to this variety of drama.

REVIEWS.

Shakespeares Dramen und sein Schauspielerberuf. Von JOHANNES E. SCHMIDT. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co. 1914. 8vo. 257 pp.

The aim of this book is to show that only an actor could have written the plays known as Shakespeare's. The author rejects all documentary testimony except the fact, fully attested, that a William Shakespeare played at Blackfriars and the Globe in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Otherwise the plays themselves furnish the material for the argument and no unity is attempted in this material except its relevancy to the claim that the plays were written by a professional actor. If this claim can be established, Professor Schmidt feels that he will, by all reasonable standards, have proved that the actor-author was the one with whose name the plays are commonly associated.

The introductory chapter is concerned with the structure of the Elizabethan theatre and with Shakespeare's intimate realisation of this, as shown in the composition of the plays. Seven chapters following are concerned with illustrating and analysing the effect upon the plays of the actor's experience and knowledge of stage effects. This evidence is found (1) in the many familiar uses of the every-day language of actors in regard to stage life, both in figurative expressions and elsewhere; (2) in allusions both to types of plays and to actual plays performed in Shakespeare's time; (3) in the large amount of action—either episodic or of the main plot—to which the dramatic quality of a play-within-a-play is given; (4) in the dialogue form into which a large number of the narrative and even the monologue portions of the plays are cast; (5) in the strong influence upon his work of the stage traditions which the Elizabethan play-house inherited from earlier conditions of performance; (6) in his fondness for certain characters sure to be effective on the stage; (7) in his choice of the more general source material of his plays; and (8) in the number of actual plays-within-plays which were incorporated into the larger ones. Chapter IX includes a somewhat motley collection of material under the head of 'Bühnenwirksamkeit' and the last chapter is concerned primarily with Richard Wagner's views as to the influence of the actor upon the dramatist, as shown in the author of the Shakespeare plays. Throughout the book, however, Professor Schmidt is intent on emphasising the natural connection between acting and dramatic composition, and in calling attention to

the many great dramatists who have been actors as well, and who have been influenced by this fact in the writing of their plays. A brief 'Schlusswort' recalls the author's intention as to the bearing of the book on the Baconian theory, although the name of Bacon is scarcely mentioned in the development of the argument.

Perhaps the most interesting and telling chapter is the one entitled 'Schauspielerische Elemente der Sprache,' which is meant to show how large a part the mimetic instinct plays in the behaviour and speech of Shakespeare's characters, as where the gentleman in *Lear* tells of Cordelia's grief over the ill-treatment of her father[1], where Ophelia reports to Polonius her meeting with Hamlet[2], where Shylock answers Antonio's request for gold by a passionate speech in half dialogue form[3], where Launcelot Gobbo talks with his conscience and the devil[4], or where Launce in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*[5] repeats his talk with his dog. Dr Schmidt is especially effective too in the chapter in which he discusses Shakespeare's allusions to plays of his own and the preceding period, enlarging the range of safe inference here as compared with the number of references already pointed out by English editors of Shakespeare, though unconvincing in a few of his own attributions.

The cumulative effect of the testimony massed in support of the major claim of the book must be surprisingly strong upon one who has not already examined Shakespeare's plays with regard to this point, although the author's cause would have been better served if his illustrative material had been less inclusive. His zeal for his thesis tends to weaken the reader's confidence in generalisations entirely safe, because he rarely discriminates between what is safe and what is only probable or conjectural. This fault is the more unfortunate because the abundance of sound proof available made it easy for him to ignore most of the debateable material. It may be true, and it probably is true, that Shakespeare's close contact with the stage as an actor influenced him at every turn of his dramatic composition, but Shakespeare himself could not possibly have said just how far this was true, and it is obvious that too insistent an emphasis on this influence tends to depreciation of his natural powers as a dramatist. Further, although it is a clear matter of history that a large proportion of the greatest dramatists have been actors as well, it is also true that some of the finest masters of stage-craft have been in contact with the stage only as dramatists. This is notably true of Shakespeare's contemporaries, Beaumont and Fletcher, who in pure stage-craft probably surpassed Shakespeare. Aside too from the fact of Shakespeare's dramatic genius, much of the knowledge of stage tactics which Dr Schmidt attributes to his experience as an actor could have been acquired by any Elizabethan dramatist living closely in the life of the London theatres, as so many of them did. That a busy statesman, too sensitive to his social reputation to let his habit of play-writing be known, would hardly have haunted the stage in

[1] *King Lear*, IV, 3.
[2] *Hamlet*, II, 1.
[3] *The Merchant of Venice*, I, 3.
[4] *Ibid.* II, 2.
[5] *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, II, 3.

this fashion, is not the point at issue at this moment, although it is of course highly relevant to the general conclusion. Similarly it is dangerous to imply that Shakespeare was unique in the number of his allusions to the theatres and to plays of his age and of the preceding one. An examination of Jonson's plays alone would disprove that claim; for they are not only full of the literary influence of the religious plays upon his 'humour' characters and others even more abstract, but they abound in jocular and satirical allusions to dramatic activities of his own and earlier times. In this respect Jonson goes much further than Shakespeare.

It is very debateable, too, whether Dr Schmidt has a right to treat so popularly as he does a subject involving so many complicated problems, and one so widely interesting to scholars. Addressing himself to all those interested in Shakespeare, he apparently feels justified in departing from a severely technical treatment, in dispensing with discussions of textual interpretation, with most of the mooted points as to Shakespearian authorship in certain plays, and with all the more substantial underpinning usually associated with footnotes. His affinities are with literary critics rather than with those of the technical sort, and almost entirely with the German even here; also the dramatists and actors with whom he compares Shakespeare are nearly all chosen from his own German countrymen. This last fact, and the further one that nearly all the quotations are given from German translations, make the book slightly disheartening to an English reader, in spite of the obvious reasons for the method chosen.

It should not be implied of course that Dr Schmidt's many allusions to the experiences of actor-dramatists, and even to the views of actors who are not dramatists, are irrelevant, even though their relevancy is of the psychological rather than of the documentary or more scholarly sort. The mistake is in not including both sorts of testimony, so as to put all his psychological inferences on a sound basis. Thus, for example, he uses material from the *Henry VI* plays, from *Timon of Athens* and from *Troilus and Cressida* without showing any acquaintance with the critical controversy as to Shakespeare's part in these plays, and declares without argument that the intrigues of Elizabeth's court were reflected in the court at Elsinore, that Hamlet in greeting the players included some personal description of two of Shakespeare's fellow actors; that the 'pageants of delight' mentioned by Julia in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and the 'Whitsun pastorals' by Perdita in *The Winter's Tale*, were both of the Italian pastoral sort. Nor is he always convincing in interpreting Shakespeare's motives in using dramatic devices, as where he says that the dumb show was used in *Hamlet* for purposes of condensation. The lack of close organisation, too, in his presentation of material is disconcerting, involving him in confusing repetitions, and obscuring at times the relations of his thought.

In spite of all strictures, however, the study stands as a strong psychological argument for the influence of the actor's point of view upon the Shakespearian plays. Some of Dr Schmidt's faults of method

are so unfortunate, that he would need to rewrite his book in order to make it thoroughly sound in the field of technical research, or to have it show its potential value as an answer to the argument that a professional actor could not have written the plays ascribed to Shakespeare. He has, however, brought the material for such a reply well within reach, and has established strong ground for his claim that only a professional actor could have written them. That he has shown himself ignorant or oblivious of most of the results of English-speaking scholarship in the Shakespearian field is, for the foundations of his work, greatly to be deplored; but even this should not obscure the fact that he has widened the field of Shakespearian investigation and written an interesting and valuable book.

O. L. Hatcher.

Bryn Mawr, Pa., U.S.A.

Thomas Campion and the Art of English Poetry. By Thomas MacDonagh. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis. 1913. 8vo. 129 pp.

This little book was originally written, the Preface informs us, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts at University College, Dublin. Though it reveals the author as an interesting personality and a zealous student of poetry, it is rather curious in make-up, whether looked at as a thesis or an independent publication. The 'and' of the title, which one would think at first sight to mean 'in relation to,' or something of the sort, appears to have only its common conjunctive significance. In other words, Thomas Campion is discussed in two or three chapters, with a selection from his lyrics; then, in four or five subsequent chapters the forms of English verse are considered, with very little about Campion save by way of incidental allusion or illustration. One is led to expect some concluding chapter, in which the relation of Mr MacDonagh's prosodical doctrines to the poet's theory or practice will be made clear; but this chapter appears to be still unwritten. The only links of which we can be sure are found in the fact that in his *Observations* Campion touched on a number of fundamental metrical problems, such as quantity and accent, rime, pauses, metrical equivalence, and the like, and that on these same subjects Mr MacDonagh wishes to make observations of his own. In general, he believes Campion to have been quite at fault on the subjects of quantity and rime, but right on most others. In all which, as in some appreciative criticism of the songs in the *Books of Airs*, there is much that is good, but little or nothing that is new.

The one notably independent contribution to theory is a doctrine which Mr MacDonagh believes to be 'a truth hitherto unproclaimed,' namely, that there are in our prosody two great types of verse, song-verse and speech-verse, with a possible third corresponding to the chant. Song-verse is temporal in character, being made up of isochronous

units; speech-verse is not. Both involve rhythm, accent, and quantity, but in the latter type another element of importance appears, called (in a term of Campion's own) 'weight.' All this is very interesting, but again not unfamiliar. One is not sure of understanding the theory, because the writer fails to develop it, reserving, he says, the matter of speech-verse to another work; but it would seem to be very much the same thing as Mr Robert Bridges's doctrine of the two types of 'stressed' and 'syllabic' verse, as presented in his *Milton's Prosody*. MacDonagh's speech-verse and Bridges's syllabic-verse are both represented chiefly by the iambic pentameter, and the former describes it as having 'a fixed number of syllables' to a line. He is not familiar with Mr Bridges's work—at least he does not include a reference to it in his bibliography; neither, apparently, does he know A. J. Ellis's system of metrical analysis, with Mayor's criticism of it in his *Chapters on English Metre*. In this system the term 'weight' was introduced as a separate prosodical element[1], but Mayor's question, 'What is meant by it?' has never been clearly answered. Nor do we know how it is used in the present book, for its explanation goes over with the discussion of speech-verse.

In other words, the one matter of individual significance in our author's discussion, his view of the old question as to how we shall analyze and describe the peculiar qualities of our great pentameter measure, is tantalizingly brought forward only to be let go. On the analysis of the lyrical measures which Campion chiefly represents, Mr MacDonagh has no new theory. But his *obiter dicta* are often stimulating, and one may judge him to be a notable *talker* on his subject. He has noted the odd rhythms in the speech of Irish peasants, has persuaded Mr Yeats and Mr George Russell to recite verse to him, that he might study their metrical habits, has experimented in the chanting of Shakespeare's songs to the accompaniment of a real lyre. It would be well if he should be caught, imprisoned, and his stores accounted for by some prosodist more given to consecutive analytical method.

RAYMOND M. ALDEN.

PALO ALTO, CAL., U.S.A.

The Life of Matthew Prior. By FRANCIS BICKLEY. London: Pitman. 1914. 8vo. 295 pp.

During recent years a large amount of new material for a life of Prior has been published, and a biography is therefore more than justified. It is a great pity that Mr Waller has not continued his work, but it is now seven years since he gave hopes of a commentary on Prior,

[1] In Campion the word is not used in distinction from quantity, but as something very like it (or perhaps with the element of accent added). 'As in music,' he says, 'we do not say a strain of so many notes, but so many semi-briefs,...so in a verse the numeration of the syllables is not so much to be observed as their weight and fine proportion.'

and nothing has appeared. Mr Bickley has only attempted part of what remained to be done. We wanted a clear and accurate statement of the events of Prior's life, supported by quotations and references, an attempt to realize Prior's character and his relations to his contemporaries, an estimate of his career as a diplomatist, a detailed criticism of his literary work, an attempt to bring it into relation with his life, and a full bibliography. Mr Bickley has set out clearly the events of Prior's life, and he has used all the available information, but he has hardly attempted to reveal Prior's personality, though he constantly disparages his character and achievements. Prior's relations with his contemporaries and his work as a diplomatist could perhaps only be exhibited fully by such a master of history and literature as Macaulay. This book tells us little, but it is most inadequate in those pages which deal with Prior's literary works. 'It would be superfluous,' Mr Bickley says, 'to make a detailed examination of Prior's poetry. Literature which nobody wants to read is outside the legitimate sphere of criticism, and much that Prior wrote has passed irrevocably to the limbo of dead letters.' If this spirit were to prevail among biographers, literary history would cease to exist. It is true that much of Prior's work has been deservedly forgotton, but a biographer has a unique opportunity to study the works of his hero, to see how they grew out of his life and character, and to estimate their comparative and absolute value. Whatever else he does, before he condemns he must try to understand. Now Prior was no fool, and there is much instruction in considering why the man who wrote *Jinny the Just* also wrote *Solomon* and valued it highly. For all this work Mr Bickley has no patience. He has therefore missed an opportunity. Nevertheless Prior's next biographer or critic will be grateful to Mr Bickley for a clear and simple narrative, with no verbiage and no fine writing, with adequate references, and the work of collecting and arranging the material carefully done.

The following notes are concerned with details:

(*a*) p. 3. In stating that Prior's parents were Presbyterians until 1662, when they became Nonconformists, Mr Bickley gives as his authority Mr Seccombe's article in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (Vol. IX, p. 146), but as Mr Seccombe quotes no authority, the reference is useless.

(*b*) Mr Bickley refers several times to 'Sir James Montagu's memorandum,' without explaining what it is. A reproduction of the whole memorandum would have been very useful, but if that could not be given, a note about it should have been added. Some information will be found in the Prefatory Note to Mr Austin Dobson's *Selected Poems of Prior.*

(*c*) p. 80. 'No doubt Prior's total lack of private fortune ....' Mr Bickley often refers to Prior's low birth and poverty, but he never condemns the snobbery and mismanagement which refused or delayed to Prior the rewards of his labour and intelligence, and compelled him continually to beg for his pay. Of what significance is it that Prior

was a joiner's son? And why should we despise him because he could not live without money? Who can?

(*d*) p. 83. 'Prior went as far towards enthusiasm in his regard for Jersey as it was in him or his age to go.' Does this mean that Prior's age was incapable of enthusiastic friendship? Were not Steele, Swift, Arbuthnot, Atterbury, enthusiastic friends?

(*e*) p. 100. 'May...claimed that he held the secretaryship absolutely.' The letter from Vernon to Prior (1697, May 21) should be noticed. Vernon says that he has spoken to May 'that he be accountable to you [Prior] for the profits, which he hath promised, *and that he will refer himself to you for what you think to allow him for his pains.*' (Longleat MSS. iii. 122.)

(*f*) p. 110. The reference to 'Davenant's book' needs further explanation

(*g*) p. 145. No references are given to justify the statement that 'during the four years of Tory supremacy Prior acquired a reputation as a pamphleteer.'

(*h*) p. 152. *Hans Carvel*, etc., are tales in verse, not fables. Mr Bickley confuses La Fontaine's *Fables* with his *Contes*.

(*i*) p. 186. It is rather strange that Mr Bickley does not recognise Wotton's famous saying in Prior's Latin sentence ('Animal peregrine [*sic*] missum ad mentiendum R.P. causa').

(*j*) p. 253. Mr Bickley's statement that 'Of...*Henry and Emma* there is nothing to be said' is typical of his attitude to Prior's poetry. Cowper's remarks, at least (Letter to Unwin, Jan. 5, 1782), are worth examination.

(*k*) p. 259. The *Dialogues of the Dead* deserve more than two lines of criticism in a book of nearly 300 pages.

(*l*) p. 263. The statement that Prior 'refused even to acknowledge the literary merit of Addison and Steele' should be supported by a reference.

(*m*) p. 273. There is an ugly mistake in the text of 'My noble, lovely little Peggy.' The sixth line should read 'Our Father first, then notre Père.' Mr Bickley spoils it by adding a superfluous 'and' before 'then.'

A. C. Guthkelch.

London.

Sordello. By Robert Browning. Edited by A. J. Whyte. London: Dent. 8vo. 1913. 305 pp.

Mr Whyte has attempted a formidable but not ungrateful task in this, the first critical edition of *Sordello*. Of essays there has been a long succession, of commentaries not a few; even the humiliation of a verse-for-verse paraphrase has not been spared. But something at once more and less than these modes of help was needed. The famous 'obscurity' of *Sordello* evidently arises from a number of quite distinct

causes, and among Mr Whyte's other merits is that, we think, of having pursued the Protean genius of the specifically 'obscure' Browning—whose very headquarters are in this poem—in all its transformations. One of these transformations is not the less baffling because it is, ostensibly, the very antithesis of the obscure. The poet sees his subject—itself intricate and unfamiliar in the highest degree—with an objective clearness which seems to make guidance unnecessary: and instead of explaining it to his groping and fumbling readers, throws off cheerful but enigmatic allusions to what he and they are assumed to see in common. This kind of obscurity however might be met by a sufficient apparatus of illuminating historical commentary. Browning's 'excess of light' is responsible for other and more insidious pitfalls for which other remedies are needed. He has, for instance, his characteristic development of the Homeric simile—an image so vividly seen in every articulation, and so remorselessly and inexhaustibly described as it is seen, that the result is not, as in Homer, a beautiful diversion from the original thought, which the reader resumes, delighted and refreshed, but a kind of brilliant and alluring labyrinth interposed in his path, in whose windings he effectually loses all recollection of how he came there and where he is. Nay more—and this we think is a new point of Mr Whyte's—the apparent luminosity is sometimes a false lure; the poet does not merely husband his candles, or merely dazzle his victim by their extravagant excess; he holds out to him, with the most innocent intention in the world, what is in effect a will-o'-the-wisp—allusions, which look recondite and send him, if he is conscientious, to his dictionary or cyclopaedia, but turn out to be mere bits of expressive local colour. So the lines in the Sixth Book, describing with graphic detail

> this dismal brake of prickly pear
> Which bristling holds Cydippe by the hair,
> Lames barefoot Agathon;

where the persons named have no relation to their mythical or historical counterparts, and only simulate some connexion with one another in an adventure of their own.

One need not enlarge upon the combination of gifts requisite for dealing with a poet who among all modes of 'enigma' can be acquitted of only one—but that absolutely and without reserve—the enigma deliberately pursued and designed; and Mr Whyte shows remarkable competence, we think, alike in those which demand learning, research, or acute interpretation, and in those which require the perhaps rarer grace, in a commentator, of seeing that an ordinary or even trivial sense may be right, when a rare or subtle one is possible. But his great and distinguishing achievement is in the thorough examination to which he has subjected the historical background of the poem. Browning, Mrs Orr tells us, read some thirty books in the British Museum on the period. These were in part relatively modern works—Sismondi's *Italian Republics*, and Verci's *Storia degli Ecelini*; but he also read for himself the original chronicles, and enriched his narrative with

many graphic details, sometimes imported from quite different contexts, as well as with names which had originally a quite different relevance—all this not in confusion or forgetfulness, of which Browning is as hard to convict as Dante, but with the royal selfwill of one who holds vast learning in the grip of a no less vast imagination. Mr Whyte, a historical specialist, has thrown welcome light upon these processes, and besides making the tangled story of the Ecelins, Salinguerra, and the rest, as clear as terse summary and illustrative quotations can make it, has shown in precise detail, with an acuteness and patience rarely baffled, what Browning has drawn from each source, and where he modified or altogether deserted his sources. Sordello himself, as is well known, is a Browningesque creation, owing little enough to either the historical Sordello or to Dante's; his whole spiritual history—the essential matter of the poem—is Browning's work; his problem—to 'fit to the finite his infinity'—is Browning's problem. But the rest—the very 'finite' world in which the singer never wholly finds himself, is closely studied and brilliantly portrayed by Browning, though here also with an imagination ever on the wing and responsive to the faintest hint. And if the historical commentary is the most valuable, as it has probably been the most arduous, part of Mr Whyte's work, his edition seems to us no less exemplary on the interpretative and critical sides. The introduction, and the summaries prefixed to the several books, are illuminating and yet concise; and though there is little display of literary 'appreciation,' we are left in no doubt of the editor's opinion of the superb poetic quality of the neglected work which he has now made it so relatively easy to 'discover.'

C. H. Herford.

Manchester.

George Meredith: his Life, Genius and Teaching. From the French of Constantin Photiadès. Rendered into English by Arthur Price. London: Constable. 1913. 8vo. 253 pp.

This very pleasant essay was written avowedly to introduce Meredith to a wider public in France. It makes no pretence to complete treatment, and would be better suited with a more modest title; but M. Photiadès succeeds remarkably well in suggesting the character of Meredith's achievement. The sketch of his life is well informed and vigorous. It was written before the publication of Meredith's letters, and study of these would, we think, have modified the painful impression which M. Photiadès received of Meredith's bitter, almost querulous attitude towards the English public. Its neglect or dull hostility certainly distressed him, and its unintelligence in art earned his contempt; but his mind was never subdued to these feelings; in his own phrase, he learned 'to look elsewhere.'

Sixty pages are given up to a brilliant abridgment of *Harry Richmond.* By this ample evidence M. Photiadès attempts to exhibit Meredith's

greatness as 'the creator of beautiful stories.' Wit is a rare quality in Victorian literature, and Meredith's wit is brilliant; so for many readers—even for one so alert and sympathetic as Verrall—it has outshone and obscured his other qualities. Mr G. M. Trevelyan has rightly declared that imaginative power is no less marked a characteristic of his genius. M. Photiadès very emphatically urged this view, while he does not fail to do justice to the more obvious greatness of Meredith's comic genius, even defending the somewhat laboured and farcical comedy of Algernon Blancove and of Mrs Chump. The chapters on Meredith's art and teaching are models of compression without hint of heaviness. M. Photiadès is sometimes provocative, sometimes finely sympathetic, always stimulating.

Though in matter and treatment the book is intended for the general reader, the most devoted student of Meredith may read it with keen pleasure in its lucid and artistic construction. The opening chapter, describing a visit to Flint Cottage, is delightfully written. We have protested against the uncorrected stress on Meredith's pessimism about his own fame; but we pay tribute to the beautiful design of the passage which completes that impression and concludes the chapter:

'More showers of rain in the garden while I stand there, before going down to the station. Under the fitful wind, the ash trees creak feebly, and strange undulations course over the grass. I am alone, listening to this music. There is no one upon the watery roads. Down in the west the sun is dying in magnificence. The long shafts of gold are broken against the windows of Flint Cottage. Something divine is abroad in the solitude. But of the odours that rise from the soft, wet earth, none is so bitter as the perfume of the laurels.'

Mr Price's translation is good. The work must have been difficult, for the original is so highly coloured in style that to produce a version quite English in effect would mean to rewrite rather than to translate. Mr Price has preserved the character of the original, and the flavour of French phrase is very seldom disturbing. An index would add to the usefulness of a volume which should do good service to Meredith's fame.

A. R. Skemp.

Bristol.

Middle English Humorous Tales in Verse. Edited by G. H. McKnight. (Belles-Lettres Series.) Boston and London: D. C. Heath. 1913. lxxv + 156 pp.

The humorous element in Middle English literature has hitherto not received overmuch attention, and Professor G. H. McKnight has gone some way at least towards rectifying the matter by contributing this volume to the Belles-Lettres Series. The collection consists of three tales—*Dame Siriz, The Fox and the Wolf in the Well,* and *Sir Cleges.* Each tale may be described as representative of a distinct

type, and the editor has set his material before his readers with a considerable amount of scholarship, the Introduction, in particular, being a useful piece of work. There he has dealt in illuminating fashion with the sources and parallels of the respective tales, while for those who would wish to become still better acquainted with this side of the work he has provided an admirable bibliography extending over ten pages. Nor is the value of the tales as literature altogether overlooked: a helpful literary estimate is supplied in the course of the Introduction, and if the treatment of metrical and linguistic matters is of a rather summary kind, the main facts are nevertheless given, and the account should prove of assistance to the general reader. The least satisfactory part of the edition is undoubtedly the Glossary. The Notes are helpful up to a certain point, but the Glossary has the appearance of having been compiled in a somewhat hasty and perfunctory fashion: and this may explain, by the way, the uncertainty connected with the spelling of the word 'humorous.' The shortcomings of the Glossary, however, are a rather serious blemish in an otherwise creditable piece of work, more especially as the editor's proposal was to treat this section in an exhaustive fashion so as to dispense with a detailed treatment of the linguistic element earlier in the work. Thus Old English lengths, for instance, are incorrectly given: the root vowels in *hlæfdige*, *ænig*, *læfde*, *hleor*, and *siþ* are all represented as short, while an O.E. *ābutan* is given as the earlier form of *aboute*. Moreover the etymological details supplied are sometimes inadequate and incorrect. The word *greten* (to weep), for instance, is said to be derived from O.E. *grētan*, though the rhyme with *meten* (O.E. *mētan*) (cf *Dame Siriz* 357–8) would clearly suggest a close *ē* and consequently the O.E. form *grēotan*. Similarly the word *get* (goats) (cf. *Fox and Wolf*, 167) is here derived from an O.E. *gēt*, which is described as the plural of O.E. *gāt*: but rhyming evidence alone should have prevented this error, seeing that an open *ē* is required, thus *get* (O.E. *gāt*): *gret* (O.E. *grēat*). Then again M.E. *gar* is derived from O.N. *ger(o)a*, M.E. *forsape* from an O.E. *forsceppan*, M.E. *aske* from an O.E. *ācsian* (no mention being made of the variant *āscian*), while in connection with the forms *gradde* and *iswonge* no etymologies are given. These are matters which will need attention in a later edition of the work, but in the meantime we would welcome the appearance of the volume as filling what has hitherto been a gap in our texts available for Middle English study.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

The Place-Names of Sussex. By R. G. Roberts. Cambridge: University Press. 1914. 8vo. xxxii + 210 pp.

This book is one of the best of its family, a family of clear-cut characteristics and of special limitations. As Professor Wyld's students seem to be making a 'corner' in the investigation of English place-

names and bid fair before long to cover most of the whole field, the time has perhaps arrived when one may suggest that these indefatigable workers should pause and reconsider their method. Their services to philological-historical studies are very considerable; they have unearthed and sorted out a mass of early forms of place-names, and these forms they have submitted to a thorough phonological analysis. Phonology, indeed, is the *forte* of these young scholars, as it is of their teacher. Let us at once admit that it is often the only sure guide in this very difficult study; a knowledge of its principles enables us in numerous cases to decide for or against a proposed derivation. But phonology alone is not sufficient; it must be helped or checked by both local and historical knowledge. In addition, there is required by the investigator of place-names in one county a close acquaintance with the origin of the names of other parts of the country, and he should have a general knowledge of the methods followed by our forefathers in making names of places. Now, the place-name books of the 'phonological' school hardly ever seem to take local features into account; a name is a problem in phonology, and little else matters. Some, but not enough, attention is devoted by this school to local history. Its chief weakness, however, is a strong tendency to favour fanciful suggestions of origins, against which phonology has nothing, and commonsense everything, to object. Such a method would be condemned if used in an etymological dictionary. In his *Place-Names of Sussex* Mr Roberts phonologises almost more than his brethren. Of the hypothetical sequences which abound in his pages we may take the following as a specimen: O.E. **Wermanherst* > M.E. **Werminghherst, -hurst* > **Wærminghurst* (17th cent.) > **Wærminghurst* (18th cent.) > 19th cent. *Wā(r)miŋ(h)əst, and with rounding of *ā* after *w* > mod. (wɔmiŋ(h)əst). And yet in his preface Mr Roberts remarks: 'Since the work is not intended for beginners, I have omitted too minute an explanation of the linguistic phenomena'! On the whole Mr Roberts is a little more cautious than the others of his school about admitting fanciful origins for the place-names. For the first element of Balcombe O.E. *bǽl* 'a flame, fire of funeral pyre' is suggested. But why suggest it at all if, as Mr Roberts remarks, 'a funeral pyre was more likely to be burnt on a hill-top than in a valley'? A suggested explanation of Birdham is 'the homestead where young birds were plentiful.' Brimfast is derived from O.E. *brim* 'ocean,' 'sea,' and *fæsten* 'a fastness,' 'fort.' The second element of Bucksteep is explained as O.E. *stēap* 'lofty,' 'tall,' 'mountainous,' used as a noun in the sense of hill. Suggestions for the first element of Chilgrove are (1) O.E. *ceole* 'throat,' hence 'narrow valley'; (2) O.E. *cēol* 'a ship,' also perhaps 'a keel,' 'ridge'; (3) a personal name O.E. *Cēōla* or *Cēol-*; (4) O.E. *ċele* 'cold,' 'chill.' Mr Roberts admits that no. (4) is hardly satisfactory, and decides for (3). Why give so many useless suggestions? Isfield is explained as 'icy field.' For Rye the suggestion is seriously offered that this is the O.Fr. word *rüe* (a road) borrowed in M.E. Mr Roberts also suggests O.E. **rygebeorg* 'rye-hill' (the D.Bk form is *Rieberge*),

but thinks this is not very convincing. It is quite as convincing as *rüe*. The first element of Slaugham is thought to be O.E. *slaga* 'a slayer,' possibly used in the sense of 'a butcher,' or perhaps 'game-hunter'! The first element of Ticehurst is given as O.E. *ticcen*, 'a kid.' Mr Roberts adopts Dr Skeat's suggestion that Waltham (in Upwaltham) is from O.E. *hām* 'home' or 'house,' and an O.E. *wealt*, deduced from the adjective *unwealt*, and meaning 'unsteady' or 'infirm'; i.e. ill-built, shattered or decayed. But the above are practically all the fanciful derivations in the book. Mr Roberts, like others of his school, is constantly postulating hypothetical forms, especially forms showing mutation, as for example in the place-names Bignor, Bilsham, Bineham, Heene, Hoathly, Rodmell (O.E. **mylde*), Slindon, Slinfold and others. We do not consider that Mr Roberts has made sufficient use of personal names ending in *-wine* to explain the suffix *-ing*, which occurs frequently in Sussex place-names, especially where *-ing* is followed by a terminal such as -ham, -ton, etc. Personal names in *-wine* would, we think, satisfactorily explain the following place-names: Aldworth (Aldwine), Arlington (Eorlwine), Ashington (Æscwine), Beddingham (Beaduwine), Beeding (Beaduwine), Eringham (Erewine or Herewine), Faulking (Folcwine), Folkington (Folcwine), Heathfield (Hæðwine to explain early forms in *-ing*), Lavington (Leofwine), Rottingdean (Hroðwine?), Tortington (Torhtwine). We assign a much slighter rôle to weak forms in *-an* than Mr Roberts does. Zachrisson's work on Anglo-Norman influence on English place-names is responsible for some daring suggestions by Mr Roberts. Thus he thinks the first element of Atherington may be the O.E. personal name *Æðela* or *Æðelwine*, *r* being substituted for *l* by Norman-French influence; and this though the early forms all show *r*.

We subjoin some notes on Mr Roberts's explanations of particular place-names. Brookham cannot mean 'the homestead by the brook,' as the early form cited, *Brokesham*, points to a personal name for the first element. Searle cites *Broccesham* from an O.E. charter. Brede is perhaps the same as the dialect word 'bread' or 'brade' = space in a field, *E.D.D.* The early forms of Charleston seem to be derived from a form *Ceorloc*, a diminutive of *Ceorl*. Searle cites a number of personal names ending in *-oc*; e.g. *Honoc*, *Puttoc*, *Sideloc*, *Sidroc*, *Willoc*. The first element of Chilgrove, if it is not *Ceola* or *Ceol-*, may be *Chel* or *Chil*, forms of the common personal name *Cetel*, *Cytel*. Searle cites *Chilbert*, *Chiluert*; but these may be for *Ceolbeorht*, *Ceolweard* respectively. Chiltington is more clearly to be derived from *Cytel*. The first element of Chithurst is probably *Cytta* (Searle). It *is* 'going too far' to assume that the personal name *Croc* was increased to **Crochere*. The suffix *-here* certainly ends hundreds of O.E. personal names, but it is not added indiscriminately, but only to certain classes of words. Under Dean, *fearum* is a misprint for *ferarum*. The 1274 form of Dumpford, *Dumesford*, is perhaps a scribal error for *Dunnesford*, which would be explained by the personal name *Dynne*, as Mr Roberts suggests. Under Felpham, it is to be noted that a form **fealh*, another form of *fealu*, has

to be postulated to explain certain place-names; see *E.D.D. s.v.* 'fallow.' The early form of Goodwood, *Godmewude*, is not a case of assimilation of *n* to *m* before *w*, as Mr Roberts thinks, but merely a scribal error for *Godine*. The suggestion that Glynde is the Celtic *gleann* (Welsh *glynn*) 'valley,' with epenthetic *d*, due to 'popular etymology,' is not very convincing. In Hartfield and Harting the first element is probably the personal name **Heort*, which has to be assumed for a number of place-names. **Holmestrowe* is better explained by the possessive case of a personal name than by O.E. **hȳlm* 'holly.' O.E. *hof* 'house,' 'dwelling,' suggested by Mr Roberts as the origin of Hove, hardly accounts for the early forms *Hou, Northehou*. The first element of Kingsham, Kingston is probably the personal name *Cyng, King* from O.E. *cyning*. The first element of Lindfield is perhaps the personal name *Lind*. The early form of Lurgashall, *Letegareshale*, may be due to *Leutgar*, a Frankish form of O.E. *Hlōðgar*. Mayfield is rather 'the field of Mæg' than 'the field of the Virgin.' Pashley may be from *Passa* (Searle). Piecombe is from the personal name *Picco* (Searle) rather than from O.E. *pīca* 'point,' 'peak.' Under Poynings there is an irrelevant note in square brackets. The first element of Rackham and Racton may be O.E. *racu*, 'path,' 'track'; cf. Raughton Head, Cumberland. The second element of Rodmell may be O.N. *melr*, properly 'coarse grass' and then 'sandhill covered with such grass'; it is a common place-name element in Cumberland and Lancashire. The second element of Roffey is rather O.E. *hege* 'hay,' 'enclosure in forest' than **(ge)hæge* 'rough pathway.' Under Rottingdean read *rotung* for *notung*. Salehurst is from O.E. *sealh* 'willow' rather than *sæl* 'hall.' The first element of Slaugham is probably a personal name; Nielsen cites an old Danish name *Slag*. The terminal of Southease is hardly the hypothetical O.E. *gēa*; the early form *Suthesse* seems to point to O.E. *æsc*, the meaning being 'the south ash-tree.' The first element of Telscombe is the personal name *Tyttla* or *Tytel* (Searle), which accounts for the early forms, while **Tetele* does not. There is no reason why Uckfield should not be explained by *Wulfcytel*, which in M.E. as written by a Norman scribe would be *Ulkel* or *Ulchel*; or perhaps it was the Norse form *Ulketill* which gave *Ulkel*. The first element of Wakehurst is probably *Wacca, Wacco* (Searle) rather than O.E. **waca* 'a watcher,' 'a guardian.' The explanation of Wannock, the D.Bk form of which is *Walnock*, as *Wēala hnōc* 'the nook of the foreigners,' is ingenious; we prefer to regard the first element as a personal name, such as *Wealhwine* (Searle) or *Walen(us)* (Searle), and the second as O.E. *āc* 'oak,' but this too is not at all certain. The early forms of Warbleton seem to show a confusion between the personal names *Wærburg* and *Burghild* (or *Burghelm* or *Burgwulf* or *Burgweald*); but perhaps Zachrisson is right in supposing Norman-French interchange of *l* and *r*. Wiggonholt may be from *Wighen* (Searle) or **Wigcēne*. Winchelsea is rather from *Winchelm* (Searle) than O.E. *wincel* 'corner.' Woolbeding may be from the personal name *Wilbeald*, the early forms *Wolbeding* and *Wulbedinge* showing influence of *w* on *i*.

Under Yapton, the term 'pre-iotization' seems an ugly way of referring to shifting of stress in a diphthong.

The Introduction treats chiefly of phonological matters and inflexion and word-formation, with a note on foreign influence. Lists of separate elements of place-names are given at the end of the book. Mr Roberts has done a good piece of work, and we look forward to more by him.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

La Part de Charles Nodier dans la Formation des Idées Romantiques de Victor Hugo jusqu'à la Préface de Cromwell. Par Eunice Morgan Schenck. Monographies de Bryn Mawr College, Vol. xvi. Paris: Champion. 1914. 8vo. xii + 150 pp.

Le livre de Miss Schenck est clair et précis. Il se lit agréablement, et il prouve ce qu'il veut prouver. Il serait donc malséant de lui reprocher un peu de gaucherie et de sécheresse, par endroits, et un parti pris de division, subdivision et classification qui rappelle parfois un peu trop le catalogue raisonné: c'est par volonté d'éviter le vague et l'à peu près. Le sujet valait certes la peine d'être traité en détail. L'ouvrage est court: c'est une thèse. Dans son introduction, l'auteur prend position franchement, pose bien le problème, indique nettement le but à atteindre, puis nous y mène droit, sans détours et retours inutiles, sans jamais sortir des limites qu'il s'est fixées. C'est également un livre facile à consulter. Il y a une bibliographie, non point touffue par ambition d'être complète et de comprendre jusqu'aux infiniment petits, ce qui entraînerait loin quand il s'agit de Victor Hugo, mais simple et brève, dans son souci de s'en tenir à la question à examiner. Je n'y ai point relevé de lacune sérieuse: la biobibliographie de V. Hugo par M. l'abbé P. Dubois a paru sans doute trop tard pour être mentionnée. Il y a une table des articles publiés par Nodier dans les journaux et revues entre 1813 et 1827. Il y a un index alphabétique des noms propres cités. Il y a encore, par-ci par-là, des tables chronologiques.

Le point de départ est celui-ci: à plusieurs reprises on a cru reconnaître dans la Préface de *Cromwell* les traces d'une collaboration restée mystérieuse; l'examen du manuscrit de Hugo confirme cette hypothèse. Miss Schenck croit avoir découvert ce collaborateur jusqu'ici inconnu: c'est Nodier. Il a contribué à certaines parties de la Préface par ses écrits où Hugo a puisé des idées; par ses conversations, ses causeries amicales où Hugo a relevé des pensées, des expressions même peut-être qu'il a retenues et insérées dans son œuvre; enfin il est possible que Nodier ait connu le manuscrit de la Préface et qu'il ait suggéré des additions ou des modifications dont a profité le texte imprimé. Miss Schenck a donc été amenée à étudier l'œuvre critique et l'œuvre originale de Nodier avant 1827; celle-ci était bien connue, celle-là

beaucoup moins. Miss Schenck a conduit son enquête avec méthode et les résultats en sont précis. Il en ressort que l'on a jusqu'ici beaucoup trop négligé la part de Nodier dans la formation des idées de Hugo. Comme Hugo le poète, Hugo le critique était

Mis au centre de tout comme un écho sonore,

et une oreille attentive peut reconnaître, grossie, dans les phrases éloquentes de la Préface, ainsi que dans certaines Ballades et certains romans (*Han d'Islande* et *Bug Jargal*), la voix plus frêle, mais nette de Nodier.

Miss Schenck distingue dans l'œuvre de Nodier avant 1827 une période de préparation de 1800 à 1813, et une période de maturité de 1813 à 1827. Elle a dépouillé les périodiques auquels Nodier a collaboré ; elle a utilisé les notes d'un étudiant prises au cours que Nodier professa à Dôle en 1808. Elle constate que 'l'évolution du mouvement en France sera presque une image nette de l'évolution individuelle de Nodier : d'abord, admiration des chefs d'œuvre étrangers, ensuite application de leurs principes à la littérature française.' Cette évolution de Nodier ne fut point brusque, mais graduelle ; le critique, d'éducation classique, n'accepta point sans résistance les enthousiasmes romantiques de l'homme et de l'écrivain. Nodier critique condamna toujours le 'genre frénétique' même quand Nodier écrivain le pratiqua. Déjà en 1814, il écrivait dans les *Débats* : 'Puisque cette littérature nouvelle est l'expression de la société, il est inutile de lutter contre elle; elle doit être la nôtre.' Et en fin de compte le critique s'en tira par sa distinction ingénieuse entre le 'frénétique,' qu'il continua de rejeter, et le 'fantastique' qu'il approuva et adopta. Très tôt, deux ou trois préoccupations semblent dominer l'œuvre de Nodier. Il admire sincèrement Shakespeare qu'il paraît bien avoir connu beaucoup plus familièrement que Hugo ne l'a jamais fait. Un des premiers, il s'intéresse à la littérature du moyen âge, et apprécie surtout l'architecture gothique. Miss Schenck fait remarquer que c'est vers 1823 qu'apparaît chez Hugo le 'fantastique riant et gracieux'; que l'on ne voit 'dans l'œuvre de Hugo antérieure à 1823 ni l'amour patriotique du moyen âge français, ni l'amour esthétique du gothique'; que 'sans exception, les ouvrages de Nodier précédaient les ouvrages de V. Hugo du même genre.' Les idées critiques de Nodier que l'on retrouve dans la Préface de *Cromwell*, Nodier ne les avait évidemment pas toutes inventées, mais il les exprime avec insistance dans ses écrits, et Miss Schenck est persuadée que c'est 'par la voie de Nodier, auquel il devait déjà tant d'inspirations heureuses, que V. Hugo devait les avoir reçues.' Hugo a subi au début de sa vie l'influence de Chateaubriand, plus tard celle de Sainte-Beuve. Entre les deux, Miss Schenck place une 'phase Nodier,' et il semble qu'elle soit justifiée par les faits. Les relations personnelles des deux hommes éclairent leurs rapports littéraires. Ils se connurent à la suite d'un article de Nodier publié en mars 1823 sur *Han d'Islande*. Leur amitié fut assez étroite jusqu'à la publication de la Préface de *Cromwell* ; alors survint le refroidissement et la brouille. Cette coincidence permet

à Miss Schenck de résoudre d'une façon ingénieuse le problème soulevé par les trois essais publiés par Nodier dans la *Revue de Paris* en 1829–1830. Il y reprend à nouveau les idées principales de la Préface. Pourquoi ? Parce que, dit Miss Schenck, froissé d'avoir été à peine cité par Hugo dans la Préface, il se décidait, un peu tardivement sans doute, à 'réclamer son bien' et à 'réaffirmer son point de vue.'

L'idée de ce livre est sortie d'un cours fermé professé en 1909–10, à Bryn Mawr College par M. Schinz; c'est une nouvelle preuve de l'activité intelligente des Universités américaines[1].

André Barbier.

Aberystwyth.

The Battle of the Seven Arts, a French Poem by Henri d'Andeli, trouvère of the thirteenth century. Edited and translated, with introduction and notes by Louis John Paetow. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1914. 60 pp. and 10 plates.

L'édition la plus récente des œuvres de Henri d'Andeli est celle que donna, en 1880, la Société Rouennaise des Bibliophiles, avec introduction, variantes, notes et glossaire par A. Héron. Très appréciée dès son apparition, elle devint bientôt introuvable: il n'en avait été mis dans le commerce qu'une quarantaine d'exemplaires. On en est réduit, trop souvent, au texte publié pour la première fois par Jubinal en 1838, et reproduit en 1839, puis en 1875 dans son édition des œuvres de Rutebeuf. Une nouvelle édition des œuvres du spirituel 'trouvère normand' eût donc été la bienvenue; M. Paetow ne nous offre que la *Bataille des sept Arts*, et il nous prévient lui-même que son livre n'a pas été fait à l'usage des philologues. Donc, point d'appareil critique et de discussion de texte: M. Paetow suit Héron, en adoptant, presque toujours, les corrections proposées par Gaston Paris en 1881. Point non plus de commentaire grammatical ou littéraire, bien que le sens, par endroits, reste assez obscur. Par contre, une excellente reproduction in-extenso des deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris qui nous ont conservé le poème de d'Andeli. La traduction anglaise que M. Paetow imprime vis à vis du texte français, vers par vers, est généralement fidèle et satisfaisante[2].

[1] A la p. 63, il y a deux fautes d'impression assez graves qui faussent deux vers dans la citation de l'ode de V. Hugo, *Le Voyage*. Il faut rétablir:

'Pourtant, il faut encore, à tant d'ennuis en proie,'

et plus loin:

'Sans toi, sans ton sourire et ton regard joyeux.'

[2] Voici cependant quelques observations suggérées au cours d'une lecture attentive: v. 20, 'reduced in numbers' ne semble pas bien traduire 'rest mise au mains'; ne serait-ce pas plutôt 'disparaged'? vv. 40–41, 'por' est mal compris: il a le sens causal. v. 89, 'strict theological questions' donne un sens trop étroit à 'clergie'; cf. v. 271. v. 91, la note de M. Paetow ne fait que confirmer la remarque de Gaston Paris: les étudiants de la faculté des 'Arts' négligent la grammaire pour les 'livres de nature.' v. 128, le français ancien 'poison' n'a pas le sens du moderne 'poison.' v. 289, 'un grant mail' n'est pas 'a huge battle-ax.' Ce ne sont guère là que de vétilles.

La Bataille des sept Arts est le tableau plaisant, sous forme allégorique, de la lutte entre l'Université de Paris et l'Université d'Orléans. L'armée d'Orléans, sous les ordres de Grammaire, réunit les conservateurs, fidèles à l'étude traditionnelle de la grammaire et des poètes latins. L'armée de Paris, que commande Logique, est celle des partisans des études nouvelles. Les troupes ennemies se rencontrent près du château de Montlhéry. Henri d'Andeli, parodiant le style des chansons de geste et la *Psychomachie* de Prudence, décrit les combats singuliers et les mêlées où figurent les 'auteurs du programme' de Paris et d'Orléans, et les 'Universitaires,' poètes, écrivains, savants de l'époque. Le poème est une mine de renseignements précieux sur l'enseignement universitaire du temps de l'auteur. Voilà ce qui fait son intérêt aux yeux de M. Paetow. Son édition s'adresse principalement aux historiens; il désire placer entre leurs mains, sous une forme facilement accessible et maniable, un document pour servir à l'histoire intellectuelle du moyen âge, et en particulier, à l'histoire 'des études classiques à travers les âges.' Cette histoire est très mal connue en ce qui concerne le treizième siècle. M. Paetow s'en plaint; ses notes copieuses et érudites contribueront à éclaircir bien des points douteux; son introduction contribuera sans doute à redresser bien des idées fausses. M. Paetow n'entraîne cependant pas toujours la conviction de son lecteur. Dans la controverse violente qui agita le monde universitaire au treizième siècle, il voit un premier épisode de la fameuse 'Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes.' C'est forcer un peu, semble-t-il, le sens de cette expression consacrée. La lutte entre ceux qui veulent maintenir la tradition universitaire, et ceux qui proposent de renouveler et de rajeunir les programmes d'études, a toujours existé, depuis qu'il y a des hommes...et qui enseignent; on la retrouve aujourd'hui, et M. Paetow y fait de nombreuses allusions. Mais la question qui amena la 'Querelle' n'est point du tout la même et les deux, malgré certains points communs, ne sauraient se confondre. Il a pu arriver que les partisans les plus convaincus des études classiques fussent aussi les plus farouches défenseurs des 'Modernes'; cela s'est vu au quinzième siècle.

La partie la plus neuve et la plus intéressante de l'introduction est celle où M. Paetow considère le développement et le déclin des auteurs classiques au douzième et au treizième siècles; on y trouve une foule de faits qui témoignent de l'érudition et des fructueuses recherches de l'auteur. L'impression générale cependant qui reste après la lecture est assez peu nette. La faute en est sans doute au sujet et à l'état actuel de nos connaissances, encore fragmentaires, qui rendent difficile encore une esquisse rapide, précise et claire de l'histoire des études universitaires à cette époque. Cette esquisse, M. Paetow nous la donnera certainement un jour. En attendant, son ouvrage apporte une contribution importante à l'élucidation de questions obscures dont l'étude exige une longue patience. Le livre se présente bien: de grand format, admirablement imprimé, il fait honneur à l' 'University of Columbia Press.'

André Barbier.

Aberystwyth.

Zur Bildung des Imperfekts im Frankoprovenzalischen. Die *v*-losen Formen, mit Untersuchungen über die Bedeutung der Satzphonetik für die Entwicklung der Verbalformen. Von JOHANN ULRICH HUBSCHMIED. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer. 1914. 8vo. x + 160 pp.

This work, published as a *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, discusses a group of dialects which might less clumsily be called 'Lemannic,' from the lake that they surround. The subject-matter is the later development of inflections corresponding to early French *-eie, -eies, -eit, -iiens, -iiez, -eient.* The author devotes a few pages to ancient texts, but the greater portion of his work deals with the modern dialects. His chief source of material is the *Atlas linguistique de la France.* The *Atlas*-records contain much valuable information; it is however a question whether we always find what we expect in the *Atlas.* Many French dialects have *ž emõ* for *nuz emõ*, and the author mentions the use of *no* < *nōs* as a singular (p. 102). Hence it is hardly safe to take from the *Atlas* a form meaning *pouvais* or *savions* and say that we know the historic development: perhaps we have a *pouvions* in one case, and a *savais* in the other.

I believe the *Atlas* was made up from translations of spoken French. If this is so, some of the maps used, with *il* before a consonant, may give forms that belong to the plural. For the third person of the plural, four maps are mentioned (p. 3): three of them have *ils* before a consonant. Thus it is possible that the *Atlas* contains faulty translations due to the ambiguity of spoken French. Of course the *Atlas* is not the author's only source of information, but perhaps the faults of the *Atlas* occur in his other sources. On p. 35, and again on p. 56, he mentions a sound that was heard as *i* by one person, and as open *e* by another, while still another seems to approach the truth in calling it an inner *e.* This vowel was presumably the medio-palatal sound *i̯* (= Rumanian *î*), or a sound between *i̯* and *ə* (= English *e* in *bakery*). The *Atlas* lacks a symbol for the vowel *i̯*, although this sound exists in a dialect spoken near Paris[1]. Neither does the *Atlas* have any symbol for the neutral sound *ə*; if *ə* occurs in French dialects, it is probably misrepresented as *ö* (= French *e* in *dedans*).

The chief aim of the author is to show that we must admit multiple developments, for example *avit* = *avet* = *aveit* < *habēbat*, depending on stress or position. This is clearly true as a general principle; we may compare *s* < *has* (after a voiceless sound) and *z* < *has* (after a voiced sound), in spoken English, where weakening of stress has caused the verb-stem to disappear. But whether the author is generally right, in regard to the many details that he discusses, is a question which can hardly be settled, so long as we do not know the whole history of each dialect involved, and so long as we do not know, in certain cases

[1] *Revue des patois gallo-romans*, IV, p. 12.

whether he is dealing with *il devait* or *ils devaient, il viendrait* or *ils viendraient.* In most cases the author's statements seem reasonable, but in regard to a few points changes are evidently needed. A curious mistake is to be seen on p. 43, where the author ventures outside of the Romanic field and says that German *dū* has developed 'keine Form **dau*' such as we should expect beside *hūs* > *haus.* I find the form *dau* given by Reis in his work on the modern German dialects[1].

On p. 102, after discussing *avin* = *habēbam,* the author says that the Latin nasal has been preserved in this form. I find it hard to believe that *avin* came from **avéam* (or **avéan* < *habēbam*) without analogic alteration; but if it did, the author has spoiled his own argument by saying that the development of feminine *min* from *meam* is 'durchaus nicht sicher' (p. 103), and by constructing an imaginary **meane* to explain *min.* If *avin* came from **aveam* or **avean*[2], it is evidently possible that *la min* came from *illam meam,* with a parallel re-stressing of the stressless form: **illàm *meàm *masiōne *aveàm *vendūta.* In the interests of truth and of his own theory, the author should have left out p. 103.

On p. 110, the author assumes that *uia* normally became **véa,* and then tries to account for non-riming derivatives of **véa* and **avéa.* This is much ado about nothing, for the author is on the wrong road at the outset. Latin *uia* and *inuiat,* with root-stress, developed close *i,* just as *duas* formed close *u* from *ŭ.* Normal **enveare* produced analogic **envéat* > *enveie* as a variant of normal **envíat* > *envie.* The variation between *enveie* and *envie* produced *veie* beside normal *vie* < *uia.*

Although this work deals mainly with modern dialects, the author seems to have no definite method of representing sounds. Thus the letter χ is used for the voiceless velar fricative on p. 141: this χ is the author's symbol, replacing an entirely different symbol of the original. But when the author quotes the same sound from the *Atlas,* he uses for it a circumflexed *c* (p. 63), which is different from the *Atlas*-symbol also. And on p. 139 he uses χ with a different meaning: in this case he has quoted another notation, but many readers would not suspect the fact.

The author does not define his own symbols, and generally he fails to explain those that are quoted. An exception is to be found on p. 110; here a special symbol, apparently a quoted one, is defined with the help of an unexplained symbol. But the reader must guess which symbols are quoted and which are the author's: they are not distinguished. For example, on p. 115 the word *tšantar* is given in the author's notation; on p. 45 the same word is quoted, with the same reference, but in the different notation of the original. In § 12 the author uses *š* to transcribe the crossed *c* of the *Atlas,* and also Greek ϵ as an imitation of it. It would be hard to imagine anything more

[1] Reis, *Die deutschen Mundarten,* Berlin, 1912, p. 97.
[2] Compare Italian *con* < *cum.*

absurd. When a writer uses two different letters for one sound, quoted from the same source, he shows that he has little respect for his readers, and no true understanding of scientific methods.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., U.S.A.

The Piscatory Eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro. Edited with Introduction and Notes by WILFRED P. MUSTARD. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1914. 8vo. 94 pp.

Professor Mustard's work falls readily into three sections: the introduction, the text of the eclogues, and the notes. Sannazaro's poems had often been printed before—we could point out editions in each of the past centuries since their first publication in 1526 (Naples) down to their last reprint in 1899[1]. The variant readings are not many and of little importance, hence the labours of the editor in this regard were not arduous; however his work, let us hasten to say, is excellently done; the punctuation is judicious and not obtrusive.

When we turn our attention to the notes, our task is equally easy and pleasant. Earlier critics had pointed out most of Sannazaro's debts to the classics[2]; Professor Mustard has added not a few, though he has refrained from any artistic valuation of this indebtedness. We all know how tempting it is for the critic to point out as sources parallel passages, simple expressions, that in reality could only be connected with the text by an effort of imagination. Dr Mustard has not yielded too often to this temptation[3]; and the comments he gives are concise and exact, the best authorities being cited whenever any discussion arises.

[1] *Le egloghe pescherecce di Jacopo Sannazaro e altre poesie latine dei secoli XV e XVI* recate in versi italiani da Luigi Grilli, Città di Castello, Lapi, 1899.

[2] Apart from previous editors of the eclogues A. Campaux, *De Ecloga piscatoria*, Parisiis, apud A. Durand, 1859, and Giuseppe Rosalba, *Le egloghe pescatorie di Jacopo Sannazaro*, Napoli, Tornese, 1908, have been Dr Mustard's most useful and most used forerunners.

[3] Especially with a writer so ready as Sannazaro was to borrow from the classics, it is difficult, perhaps, to bear in mind that even he may at times have thought of an original expression. Taking only the first eclogue I cannot see e.g. any connection between 'meae quondam requies spesque unica vitae' (l. 61) and Hor. *Od.* I, 14, 17 'nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium, | Nunc desiderium curaque non levis'; or between 'sed fabula et umbrae | Frustrantur miseras per dira insomnia noctes' (ll. 67—68) and Hor. *Od.* I, 4, 16 'iam te premet nox fabulaeque manes,' or Pers. *Sat.* v, 152 'cinis et manes et fabula fies.' The resemblance between ll. 91—97 and Stat. *Silv.* v, 3, 19—27 is very remote indeed; as is the connection between 'Ut Nymphis Nereoque, ut flavicomae Amphitritae, | Sic tibi victrices fundent libamina cymbae' (ll. 99—100) and Virg. *Ecl.* v, 79 'ut Baccho Cererique, tibi sic vota quotannis | agricolae facient.' Also in other passages of this and of the other eclogues I think one might give Sannazaro the benefit of the doubt, and avoid an array of quotations that does not shed any real light on Sannazaro's methods or on his learning, especially as both are well known and need hardly be proved.

The introduction contains a considerable amount of useful and precise information; the principal dates and events of Sannazaro's life; a discussion of the origin of his pastoral name; a too brief account of the piscatory eclogue and of Sannazaro's claim to originality; a discussion of the dates of the eclogues; finally a list of quotations that bear witness to the popularity of these poems in different countries, from 1516 down to the early part of the nineteenth century, and an even longer list of imitators or pseudo-imitators, from Bernardo Tasso to Parini and to Moses Browne. All the facts needed for a study of Sannazaro as a poet and of the piscatory eclogue are here, but the critic has effaced himself so effectively that we must assume it to have been his intention to refrain from opinions of his own. If this were a reprint of Virgil's *Eclogues* or of Milton's *Lycidas* or of any work on which criticism had passed a definite and incontrovertible judgment, the plan might be approved, though in such a case there would hardly be any necessity for so much arduous toil. Even if there was a book on the subject, to which reference were made and in which the critical appreciation were satisfactorily given, the plan might be defended. But, unless we are greatly mistaken, such a book does not exist, and the opinions about the eclogues differ so widely that a real critical study should have been worth while attempting.

Professor Mustard indeed makes a passing reference (p. 52) to a modern general book on piscatory poems, Dr H. M. Hall's *Idylls of Fishermen*, which has already been noticed in the *Modern Language Review* (VIII, pp. 392 ff.); but the reader who should hope for guidance from this other transatlantic scholar may be disappointed. The first section of this book is admittedly a re-elaboration, with some additions, of Campaux's essay, though Dr Hall has attempted 'to trace the relationship between the piscatory and the bucolic' (p. 199). On the whole this section, or Campaux's work, or Rosalba's, may serve as illustrations of Dr Mustard's notes.

Notwithstanding Campaux's words: 'Ea sunt fere, nisi quid omisi, quae quidem apud Veteres ad carmen piscatorium plusve minusve accedentia reperire est, ex quibus sane colligitur piscatores homines multo minus quam dictum est a Veteribus esse neglectos, ac non ita raro, ut vulgo creditur, in eorum fictiones inductos[1],' it must be acknowledged that Sannazaro is the first important writer of piscatory idylls. Many of his predecessors merely wrote about fishing or fishermen in a straightforward way, free of any poetic convention; fishlore in itself is as far removed from piscatory idylls, as the art of breeding sheep is alien to the poetic convention that is generally called pastoral. Whether Theocritus ought to be classed with the simple and realistic poets or with the conventional ones is still debated; whereas no one will dispute that Virgil's eclogues are essentially conventional and therefore provide us with a definite starting point. Likewise the more one reads of piscatory eclogues or about them, the deeper becomes one's

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

conviction that the piscatory eclogue is Sannazaro, and that Sannazaro is the piscatory eclogue. Dr Mustard's book has thus a great advantage in method over Dr Hall's; inasmuch as the former centres his attention on Sannazaro and passes from him to his forerunners and to his imitators, whereas the latter tries to visualize far back in the Alexandrine period a literary species, that was artificially brought into being about 1500, and to trace its decay to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The second chapter of Dr Hall's book deals with Sannazaro and his imitators, but his account lacks accuracy in several particulars[1], above all in ascribing the inspiration of the piscatory poems to Sannazaro's fondness for the Villa Mergellina without any reference to the debateable chronology of the eclogues and to the date in which the poet became possessed of the villa. As Dr Hall's book does not supply the deficiency we noticed in Professor Mustard's, we are compelled to turn to such general works as Dr Greg's[2] and Professor Carrara's[3], but these—excellent books as they are—having a wide field to cover could give only passing attention to the piscatory phenomenon.

In Dr Greg's words, the pastoral 'fiction no doubt answered to some need of human nature, but in literature it soon came to be no more than a polite convention[4].' On the other hand the Neapolitan atmosphere at the end of the fifteenth century was peculiarly well suited to the growth of such poetry[5]; and Sannazaro, a pupil and a friend of Pontano, endowed with a melancholy and truly idyllic turn of mind, soon conceived the idea of writing in the pastoral strain. Like most writers of the Renaissance he could only perceive one method of attaining artistic perfection, namely imitation, and yet, apart from his moral qualities which endear him to us above all his contemporaries, he nurtured some mildly rebellious instincts. His was not an original mind, but he would fain have wished that it had been. It was not in his nature to strike out on a new path, and yet he was not satisfied with servile imitation. Therefore in most of his works, especially in the *Arcadia* and in the *Piscatory Eclogues*, there is an attempt, or, if one prefers, a persistent aspiration, at improvement, at novelty that should entitle him to the claim of originality without laying him open to the charge of having disregarded classic models. The really original mind is mostly unconscious of its originality; Sannazaro was, in his small way, intentionally original. In the *Arcadia* he dared to shift the action from a conventional to a real landscape, to give his shepherds and nymphs definite features, and to describe carefully their occupations; in the piscatory eclogues he struck upon the scheme of substituting fishermen for shepherds and the sea shores for

[1] E.g., p. 45 we read 'Academia Pontana' for 'Pontaniana'; on p. 61 the loss of certain eclogues is taken for granted, as to which cp. Rosalba, *op. cit.*, pp. 34—49.

[2] *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, by Walter W. Greg, London, Bullen, 1906.

[3] *La Poesia Pastorale* di Enrico Carrara, in 'Storia dei Generi Letterari,' Milano, Francesco Vallardi, s.a. (1908).

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

[5] Cp. F. de Sanctis, *Storia della Letteratura italiana*, Milano, Treves, 1912, II, pp. 330—331.

the woods and the meadows. A modern critic may smile at the tenuity of the innovation; Sannazaro was proud of it; he was at pains to set forth his claim[1], and his contemporaries did not stint their praise. Professor Mustard quotes from several writers who admired his art, but he could easily have added passages from others, such as Antonio Galateo, who, in a letter to Sannazaro wrote: 'ah Mergelline, ah Pausylipon, o ubi est ille Piscator, qui mihi canat per amoenos scopulos docta illa quae nuper ipse fecerat carmina[2]?' or Giannettasio who in the preface to his piscatory and nautical poems said: 'apud me plus valet Acti nostri auctoritas, qui primus ea laude piscatores introduxit in eglegis ut post Virgilium nemo sit qui illi praeponendum videatur[3].'

If one bears in mind this mental tendency of Sannazaro's, his innovation becomes easy to explain. Models such as Theocritus and Ausonius were quite sufficient, together with the daily proximity to the sea, to encourage the Neapolitan poet in his new enterprise. This same mental tendency is apparent in yet another instance. The first eclogue is a *commemoratio* such as Virgil's fifth eclogue, but instead of bemoaning, as was usual, the death of an expert shepherd or fisherman, Sannazaro chose to bewail the death of Phyllis, following in this case, as Rosalba suggests[4], a far more original poet, Bojardo.

There are other witnesses to Sannazaro's popularity[5], down to the end of the eighteenth century. Indeed no one seems to have bestowed upon the piscatory eclogue anything but praise, until the French critics of the seventeenth century began to formulate a theory of pastoral poetry, and, in so doing, raised objections that were often repeated.

Fontenelle disapproved of the eclogues of fishermen because, he wrote, 'j'y sens toujours que l'idée de leur travail dur me blesse[6].' For singing, and above all an idle life, becomes none but shepherds. Rapin had anticipated Fontenelle's judgment, though he could not forgo a wavering admiration for Sannazaro. He wrote:

> Hos omnes ingenuitate, simplicitateque dictionis et bucolici affectus amoenitate superavit vir ingenii perelegantis et blandissima scribendi dulcedine commendatissimus Sannazarius; quamquam erit postea disputandum an inter bucolicos scriptores recenseri debeat; est enim difficultas non mediocris.

And a little further he explains his difficulty:

> De venatoribus vero, piscatoribusque res habet plus difficultatis: tametsi nemo sit, qui nesciat cantus ab utriusque instituto esse vel maxime alienos...sed facit negotium praestantissimorum inter Italos poetarum Sannazarii et Rotae et

[1] Cp. Mustard, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[2] Quoted in *Lettera del signor Bernardino Tafuri intorno alle invenzioni poetiche uscite dal regno di Napoli*, in 'Raccolta di opuscoli scientifici e filologici' (Calogerà), Venezia, Zane, 1731, T. v, p. 241.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 6—7.

[5] We might add however an anonymous Italian translation by Domenico Giuntini which appeared in *Raccolta di opuscoli letterari* (Calogerà), Ven., Zane, 1732, T. vi, pp. 141 ff. Probably more references could be found in M. Mangani, *Origine e svolgimento dell' ecloga pescatoria italiana*, Nicastro, Bevilacqua, 1902, but the reviewer has been unable to find this book in England.

[6] *Discours sur la nature de l'éclogue*; cp. Mustard, p. 20.

apud Batavos Grotii auctoritas, quorum exstant piscatoriae eclogae sane incomparabiles[1].

Moses Browne had some reason to scoff at Rapin's criticism: 'He changes, Frenchman-like, and is so volatile in opinion, affirms and denies in the same breath, and uses such freedom of conjecture that his arguments will carry less authority[2].'

In reality Browne endorsed the strictures of Fontenelle which had been echoed by Steele in the *Guardian* (1713), and by Rooke, and to which Dr Johnson adds the weight of his authority in 1750 (*Rambler*). These criticisms, mentioned and quoted by Dr Mustard[3], are evidently interdependent; Steele or Fontenelle must have been the source also for Beaupré Bell's words:

> We shall find Sannazarius not blameable merely for changing the scene, but for changing it for such a one as fills Us with Ideas incoherent with that Serenity and Tranquillity, we are naturally so desirous of. If the Pastoral Life pleases Us, because it is free from Care and Trouble, the Laborious and Painfull Life of *Fishermen* must for the same reason raise Ideas in Us of a Nature far from Pleasing[4].

It ought not to be assumed however that in England everyone accepted such criticism without discussion. In fact Vicesimus Knox had to record some dissentient voices; he wrote:

> There happened, at that time, to prevail a prejudice against modern Latin poetry, occasioned by a capricious censure of it by Boileau...[5], but we may readily believe that a selection conducted by the taste of Pope could not but abound in beauty.

He proceeded to regret that Pope, in his *Selecta Poemata Italorum*, should have omitted the original preface which, according to him, was 'equally remarkable for its modesty and taste.' He acknowledged however the fittingness of the traditional criticism, and he added: 'The charms however of fine language and melodious verse can almost reconcile us to the absurdity of design; and these charms are very conspicuous and captivating in the Eclogues of Sannazaro[6].' Dr Knox quoted another admirer of Sannazaro 'the late philosopher of Salisbury,' who had written:

> I can by no means omit Sannazaro, whose Eclogues, in particular, formed on the

[1] Renati Rapini, S. J., *Eclogae cum dissertatione de carmine pastorali*, Parisiis, 1723, pp. cxviii—cxix and cxl.

[2] *Angling Sports in nine Piscatory Eclogues.* With an Essay in *Defence* of this undertaking by Moses Browne, London, Dilly, 1773 (3rd ed.), p. xix. Browne's and Rapin's remarks might well be added to Dr Mustard's list.

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 22—26.

[4] *The Osiers, A Pastoral Translated from the Latin of Sannazarius, with some Account of Sannazarius and his Piscatory Eclogues* [by Beaupré Bell], Cambridge, University Press, 1724, p. 2.

[5] Boileau's views on modern Latin writers are solemnly expressed in his letter to Brossette of October 6, 1701; in his *Fragment d'un dialogue contre ceux qui font des vers latins*, and in a fragment of a Latin poem; cp. Boileau Despréaux, *Œuvres*, Paris, Dabo, 1820, III, p. 225 (lettre XIX^{e}); II, pp. 210—215; pp. 145—146.

[6] *Essays, Moral and Literary*, by Vicesimus Knox (2nd ed.), London, Baynes, 1822, I, p. 363, p. 366 and p. 367.

plan of a fishing life instead of pastoral, cannot be enough admired both for their latinity and their sentiment[1].

In Italy Fontenelle's criticism seems to have had little effect apart from Baretti who delivered himself of a slashing attack on all pastoral poets with the sole exception of Theocritus; Virgil's pastorals are as distasteful to him as Fontenelle's, Spenser's, Pope's, and Sannazaro's[2]. G. B. Tafuri, whose letter has been already quoted, mentions several writers who had nothing but praise for Sannazaro, among them D. de Angelis, Morei, G. P. d' Alessandro[3]. Fontenelle's views, or Pope's and Steele's and Johnson's, meet, as Dr Greg rightly remarks, 'with small mercy at the hands of the modern historical school of criticism[4].' Dr Greg is however less felicitous in his reply to Steele's criticism. The latter had assumed that the conditions of fishermen's lives 'in their own nature are uncomfortable and dreadful'; and the modern critic urged: 'An afternoon's idling along the cliffs of Sorento (*sic*) or the shore of Posilipo (*sic*) will supply a sufficient answer to such ignorant conceit as this[5].' So far as the actual conditions of the life of Neapolitan fishermen are concerned, Dr Greg is absolutely right, but how much of these conditions is to be found in Sannazaro's eclogues? Very little. Indeed the eclogues have been very often praised for what they do not contain, just as they have been blamed for faults that are not properly theirs.

They have been proclaimed tedious in common with all pastorals, yet tediousness and entertainment depend just as much on the quality of the writing as on the taste of its readers. There are modern readers, and we fear critics as well, who have condemned even the *Orlando Furioso* as tedious, whereas it enjoyed an immense popularity among all classes when it was published. Professor Carrara justly remarks that in future ages the novels that are so popular nowadays may well be considered tedious and boring; and future critics were they to condemn them would only show their ignorance of our present mind[6]. The eclogues have been said to be unreal, but this criticism has been justly stigmatised by Dr Greg[7].

On the other hand Scaliger preferred *Galatea*[8] to all the other

[1] Mr D. Nichol Smith, to whom I am indebted for much help, pointed out to me that this 'philosopher' is James Harris; cp. *The Works* of James Harris, London, 1801, II, p. 545.

[2] Giuseppe Baretti, *La Frusta letteraria*, Napoli, Pierro, 1832, II, pp. 168—169. 'Questa inevitabile semplicità d' argomento rende necessariamente tutte le pastorali poesie troppo fra se stesse somiglianti ne' punti principali; quindi è, che chi ha letto il solo Teocrito si è ripiena la mente di quante idee possono essere somministrate dalla poesia pastorale; per conseguenza non si troverà sostanzialmente il cervello più ricco di tali idee quando alla lettura de' bucolici versi di Teocrito aggiungesse anche la lettura di quelli di Virgilio, e poi di quelli di Fontenelle e di Segrais, e poi di quelli di Spenser, di Philips, e di Pope e finalmente di quelli del Sannazaro, del Tasso, del Guarini e del Bonarelli.'

[3] *Op. cit.* in *Raccolta di opuscoli* (Calogerà), T. v, p. 229 ff.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 417.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 415.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 199.

[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 1—2; p. 414.

[8] J. C. Scaligeri, *Poetices libri septem*, apud P. Santandream, 1586, lib. VI, pp. 816 ff.

Eclogae, whereas we find it cold, because of its strict imitation of classic models and of its lack of real feeling; on the contrary we seem to listen to real anguish and grief when reading these lines of *Phyllis*:

> Nam quid ego heu solis vitam sine Phyllide terris
> Exoptem miser? aut quidnam rapta mihi luce
> Dulce putem? quidve hic sperem? quid jam morer ultra
> Infelix? (I, 51—54.)

And there is an even greater appeal to our feelings when, freeing himself from the shackles of convention, Sannazaro gives vent to the sadness that was so deeply ingrained in his mind, as in *Proteus* (81—91), where he bewails his master's exile. The truth is that Sannazaro was endeavouring to draw a new design in an old framework, and he seldom allowed himself to express those real feelings of sadness and of loyalty to his friends that make him so remarkable an appearance among the literary men of his time. How many of them could have written what he wrote of himself:

> Prosit, amicitiae sanctum per saecula nomen
> Servasse, et firmam regibus usque fidem?
> (*El.* III, ii, 105—106.)

It is true that *Proteus* pleases us more because in it the appeal of surrounding nature is given more play, but nothing could be more inadequate and amusing than the belauding of these eclogues on the ground that they reproduce the charm of the divinely beautiful shores of Posillipo, Sorrento and Capri.

The influence of Boileau's rigour cannot be said to be still active, but, alas! the knowledge of Latin, or at least the easy familiarity with Latin, is diminishing every year, with the result that, when the numbers of those who turn to Virgil and Horace for pleasure and entertainment is steadily decreasing, there is small chance that the Latin writers of the Renaissance should receive such attention as their real merits would deserve. Not only are many remarkable works forgotten, but, considering that practically three-fourths of the literature of Italy, between the end of the fourteenth and the first half of the sixteenth centuries, was written in Latin, the knowledge of Italian literature proper is sadly hampered. We cannot therefore but be grateful to Dr Mustard for a reprint that ought to render Sannazaro less difficult of access to modern readers and thus secure to him the privilege that at least those who write about him should take the trouble of reading his works.

Cesare Foligno.

Oxford.

The German Lyric. By JOHN LEES. London: J. M. Dent & Sons. 1914. 8vo. 266 pp.

The opening sentence of Dr Lees' Foreword (dated April, 1914): 'A short history of the German lyric for English readers should need no apology,' has gained much in suggestiveness since last summer. At a time when relations between England and Germany were growing comparatively harmonious, any good book on this subject, far from needing an apology, would have been sure of a hearty welcome. As things are, it is to be feared that Dr Lees' book will not be so cordially received in many quarters as it might otherwise have been. But there are, no doubt, many amongst us who will consider it especially welcome just now as a reminder that even Germany is not really so black as she has allowed her diplomatists, her militarists, and even some of her lyricists to paint her recently.

The author's primary object has been 'to supply a lucid and concise guide to students of German minor poetry,' but he hopes that his book may also 'serve a wider public, and attract readers to authors whom hitherto they may not have known.' The principle that no man can serve two masters is particularly applicable to an attempt to cater at the same time for the two very different classes of readers thus indicated. Fortunately Dr Lees appears to have aimed not so much at meeting impartially the demands of both these classes, as at acting chiefly as counsellor and guide to the not yet quite mature student, who should certainly find the book both helpful and stimulating. It may at the same time, to a limited extent, serve a wider public; but most general readers will, it is to be feared, feel a lack of detailed appreciation of individual poems, and fail to be infected by an enthusiasm that cannot possibly find adequate expression in a 'lucid and concise guide.'

In his first chapter the author discusses (with rather frequent thrusts at Witkop) the nature and characteristic features of lyric poetry in general, and of the German lyric in particular. With regard to the former, a number of interesting questions—the difficulty of defining the lyric, the canon of inner truth, the importance of form, methods of composition—are dealt with somewhat briefly, but at sufficient length to give the student a general idea of the aesthetic and psychological problems arising from a critical study of lyric poetry. At the same time a fuller treatment of these questions, with more numerous quotations and references, might have considerably enhanced the value of this chapter to the best type of student. The main characteristics of the German lyric in particular are, however, very satisfactorily summarised in the eight pages devoted to this purpose, though the statement that to the Minnesinger 'only certain themes were permitted' is likely to mislead the reader ignorant of the great variety of themes actually found in their work. A poet of real originality, such as Walther von der Vogelweide, was subject to no other restriction in his choice of themes than such as were imposed by the range of his experience and his own sense of fitness. Some misconception will

probably be caused also by the summary treatment of poetic licence, as far as grammatical forms are concerned, in the one sentence: 'The sign of the past participle may be omitted, and many other such anomalies are not only permitted but quite common.' The suggestion of wholesale and wanton mutilation of standard forms conveyed by this sentence as it stands is unfortunate.

Dr Lees's plan of dealing with the history of the German lyric in seven periods, to each of which one chapter is devoted, is, on the whole, convenient and well adapted to the needs of the student, though the Minnesang and the Folksong might with advantage have each had a chapter to itself and been treated in more detail. And many of the names of the more unimportant poets might have been omitted without detriment to the value of the book. By doing so, and by confining himself more strictly to the lyric, as opposed to the ballad, the author would have saved space which might profitably have been devoted to a fuller treatment of some of the most important lyricists, and in particular to more frequent quotations and a more detailed appreciation of their most characteristic poems. Although a good general characterisation of Heine's poetry, for example, is given in about 7½ pages (exclusive of a page devoted to *Die Grenadiere*), not a single poem is discussed in any detail, while only 16 lines, in all, are quoted in illustration of his so varied themes, moods, and styles. It is true, of course, that the omission of all references to ballads would have tended towards monotony and detracted from the general usefulness of the book. It would, perhaps, have been still better if the author had decided from the first to deal equally with both the lyric and the ballad, restricting himself, if he preferred, to the nineteenth century.

In his appreciations of the individual poets Dr Lees quite rightly gives his own judgments, even though they may not always agree with those of other, and especially of German, critics. Approaching his subject with the detachment of the appraiser rather than the ardour of the enthusiast, he gives generally sound and sober estimates of the value of each writer's work, indicating briefly his strong (and sometimes his weak) points, his chief characteristics, and the themes that most attracted him. The quotations and references to individual poems are, on the whole, well chosen, though, as has been suggested above, not so numerous as might be wished.

It is the last two or three chapters, in particular, that form the more valuable part of the book. The earlier chapters, dealing with poets on whom final judgment was passed long ago, naturally enough lack freshness. But in dealing with the lyric of the nineteenth century Dr Lees fills a gap that has long wanted filling. No poet of the first rank is left unnoticed; a due sense of proportion is shown in allotting to each his or her fair share of space and attention; and in his characterisations and criticisms the author usually shows real powers of appreciation and discrimination. And yet, apart from such differences of opinion as arise from the fact that individual tastes vary, one finds oneself at times quite unable to agree with the judgments expressed. It is an overstatement of the case, for example, to say of Storm's *Trost, Schliesse mir die Augen beide,*

and *Das aber kann ich nicht vertragen*, that the language is as simple as that of the Folksong, and that there is no reflection. Even the first two of these contain lines (e.g., 'Ich sehe die Schatten der Zukunft nicht') to which this description is hardly applicable; while in the case of the third it seems quite inappropriate in face of such a stanza as:

> Indessen von den Gitterstäben
> Die Mondesstreifen schmal und karg
> In deine Gruft hinunterweben,
> Und mit gespenstig trübem Leben
> Hinwandeln über deinen Sarg.

It is difficult, again, to see why *Abseits* should be mentioned as a typical example of Storm's love of the mysterious. Like a delicately executed landscape painting, it gives us in fine detail a realistic picture of a remote corner of the moorlands in which Northern Germany abounds; the bright midday sunshine, the colour and fragrance, the sounds of insect and bird life, the peaceful existence of the cottager and his family, the stroke of the distant village clock, and over all a dreamy glamour; but no hint of the mysterious. And in another place we are told that 'the humorous is akin to tragedy and sympathetic pity' in Keller's *Das Köhlerweib ist trunken*. There can be no doubt about the tragedy, and we may agree that the poet was moved by sympathetic pity; but where is the humour? On the other hand Kopisch's well-known *Blücher am Rhein*, which is essentially humorous, is mentioned among his 'serious pieces.' It is difficult to account for such apparent errors of judgment as these except on the assumption that slips have been made in the more mechanical work of classification.

With regard to points of minor importance it may be added that, though the proofs have evidently been read with care, the following misprints have escaped notice: pp. 76 and 79 'elegaic,' p. 95 'zug,' p. 106 'wir,' p. 113 'Burgschaft,' p. 123 'Zürich,' p. 142 'Krieg-slieder'; that in a few quotations (e.g., pp. 79, 95, 96, 106) small letters are used at the beginnings of lines where we should expect capitals, in conformity with the practice otherwise followed throughout the book; that the objection taken to the rime 'preist: heisst' is not really warranted by the pronunciation of these words; that, while a few bibliographical references are given in foot-notes, many more would have been welcome and useful; and that, whether by accident or design, no mention is made of the famous *Nürnberger Trichter*, the publication of which illustrates more vividly than anything else the low level to which poetry had sunk about the middle of the seventeenth century.

In spite of the weaknesses that have been pointed out, Dr Lees' book is a useful addition to the comparatively small number of English works dealing with modern German literature. It may be recommended to students, and if it does also find favour with a wider public, we may, let us hope, look forward to a second edition of still greater value.

Francis E. Sandbach.

Birmingham.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

September, 1914—March, 1915.

GENERAL.

Bloomfield, L., An Introduction to the Study of Language. London, G. Bell. 6*s.* net.

Chandler, F. W., Aspects of Modern Drama. London, Macmillan. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Henderson, A., European Dramatists. London, G. Richards. 6*s.* net.

Hilka, A., Beiträge zur Fabel- und Sprichwörterliteratur des Mittelalters. Breslau, G. P. Aderholz. 1 M.

Kloos, W., Nieuwere Literatuurgeschiedenis. v. Amsterdam, S. L. van Looy. 1 fl. 50.

Murray, G., Hamlet and Orestes: a Study in traditional Types (British Academy). London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Italian.

Ariosto, L., Gli Studenti, Commedia. Con le continuazioni di G. e V. Ariosto A cura di A. Salza. (Documenti di storia letteraria italiana, III.) Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 1 L. 50.

Ariosto, L., Orlando Furioso. Con introduzione e commento di G. Campari e prefazione M. Scherillo. Milan, U. Hoepli. 5 L.

Bertoni, G. I Trovatori d' Italia: biografie, testi, traduzioni, note. Modena, P. Orlandini. 20 L.

Bonomelli, G., Profili de tre personnaggi italiani (G. T. di Revel, A. Fozazzaro, T. Canonico). Milan, L. F. Cogliati. 2 L. 50.

Croce, B., La letteratura della nuova Italia: saggi critici. Vol. I, II. Bari, G. Laterza. Each, 6 L. 50.

D'Ancona, A., Pagine sparse di letteratura e di storia. Con appendice: Dal mio carteggio. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 5 L.

Dante, Il Convivio, novamente annotato da G. L. Passerini. Trattati I, II. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 1 L. 50.

De Sanctis, F., Beatrice: saggio inedito a cura di G. Laurini. Naples, A. Morano. 1 L. 25.

Fatini, G., La prima giovinezza di G. Carducci (1835–57). Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 3 L.

Galilei, G., Dal carteggio e dai documenti: pagine di vita di Galileo per cura di I. Del Lungo e A. Favaro. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 3 L. 50.

Gigli, L., Il romanzo italiano da Manzoni a D'Annunzio. Con appendice bibliografica. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. 5 L.

Gozzi, G., La 'Gazzetta Veneta' per la prima volta riprodotta nella sua letteraria integrità, a cura di A. Zardo. Florence, G. C. Sansoni. 3 L. 50.

Graf, A., Foscolo, Manzoni, Leopardi: saggi. Ristampa. Turin, E. Loescher. 10 L.

Graf, A., Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo, con un' appendice sulla leggenda di Gog e Magog. Ristampa. Turin, E. Loescher. 15 L.

Hoare, A., An Italian Dictionary. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 42*s.* net.

Jacopone da Todi, Le Lande (secondo la stampa fiorentina del 1490). A cura di G. Ferri. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxix.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Metastasio, P., Opere, a cura di F. Nicolini. Vol. iv. (Scrittori d' Italia, lxviii.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Misteli, E., Die italienische Novelle. Eine Studie. Aarau, H. R. Sauerländer. 3 fr.

Nicholson, J. S., The Life and genius of Ariosto. London, Macmillan. 3*s.* net.

Pecchio, G., Vita di U. Foscolo, con introduzione e note di P. Tommasini-Mattiucci. (Documenti di storia letteraria italiana, ii.) Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 4 L.

Pellizzari, A., Dal duecento all' ottocento: ricerche e studî letterari. (Nuova Biblioteca di letteratura, storia ed arte, viii.) Naples, F. Perrella. 6 L.

Pellizzari, A., Studi manzoniani. 2 vols. Naples, F. Perrella. 5 L.

Salza, A., Studi su L. Ariosto. Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 4 L.

Williams, O., G. Carducci. (Modern Biographies.) London, Constable. 1*s.* net.

French.

(*a*) *General* (*Linguistic*).

Storm, J., Större fransk Syntax. ii. Præpositioner. Christiania, Gyldendal. 3 kr.

Terracher, A. L., Étude de géographie linguistique. Les aires morphologiques dans les parlers populaires de nord-ouest de l'Angoumois (1800–1900). Paris, Champion. 25 fr. (Atlas, 15 fr.).

(*b*) *Old French.*

Gormont et Isembart, Fragment de chanson de geste du xii^e^ siècle. (Classiques français du moyen âge, xiv.) Paris, Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Jumièges, G. de, Gesta normannorum ducum. Édition critique par J. Marx. Rouen, Lestringant. 12 fr.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Faguet, É., Balzac. London, A. Constable. 6*s.* net.

Faguet, É., Flaubert. London, A. Constable. 6*s.* net.

Fitzgerald, E., Dictionary of Madame de Sevigné. 2 vols. (Eversley Series.) London, Macmillan. 8*s.* net.

Lote, G., Études sur les vers français. i. L'alexandrin d'après la phonétique expérimentale. 2^e^ édit. 2 vols. Paris, Édit. de la Phalange. 60 fr.

Montesquieu, C. de S. Baron de, Lettres persanes. Edited by K. L. Cru. London, H. Milford. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rabelais, F., Le opere, tradotte e precedute da uno studio su Rabelais e i suoi tempi a cura di G. Perfetto. i. Naples, T. e R. Pironti. 5 L.

Stewart, H. F., and Tilley, A., The French Romanticists: an Anthology selected and annotated. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* net.

Zweig, S., Émile Verhaeren. London, A. Constable. 6*s.* net.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Loewenthal, F., Studien zum germanischen Rätsel (Germanistische Arbeiten, 1). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 4 M.

Scandinavian.

Alfræði islenzk. Islandsk encyklopædisk Litteratur. II. Rúntǫl. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved N. Beckman og Kr. Kaalund. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 kr.

Benson, A. B., The Old Norse Element in Swedish Romanticism. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol.

Bibliotheca Danica. Systematisk Fortegnelse over den danske Literatur fra 1482 til 1830, efter Samlingerne i det kongelige Bibliotek i Köbenhavn. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.

Blanck, A., Geijer i England, 1809–10. En biografisk studie paa grundvalen af bref och dagboksanteckningar. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 6 kr. 50.

Dansk Renaissance Digtning, eller Udvalgte Stykker af den Verdslige Danske Poesi mellem Arreboe og Holberg. Udg. af V. J. von Holstein Rathlou. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr. 50.

Egilsson, S., Lexicon poeticum antiquae linguae septentrionalis. Ordbog over det norsk-islandske Skjaldesprog. Foröget og paany udgivet for det kongelige nordiske Oldskriftselskab. 2. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.

Gamalnorske Bokverk, utgjevna av Det norske samlaget. XV. Egilssoga. Umsett fraa gamalnorsk av L. Heggstad. XVI. Soga um Ragnar Lodbrok og sönene hans med Kraakekvædet. Gamalnorsk grunntekst og nynorsk umsetjing ved S. Eskeland. 1 kr. 20, and 80 ö.

Kaalund, H. V., Samlede Digtninge. Udg. af O. Borchsenius. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.

Kierkegaard, S., Efterladte Papirer. Udg. af P. A. Herberg og V. Kuhr. VI. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 8 kr.

Lie, E., Arne Garborg. En Livsskildring. Christiania, H. Aschehoug. 4 kr.

Orkneyinga Saga. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved S. Nordal. 2. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.

Seip, D. A., Norskhet i sproget hos Wergeland og hans samtid. Christiania, H. Aschehoug. 2 kr. 75.

Söderhjelm, W., Oscar Levertin. En minnesteckning. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 10 kr.

Svenska Författare, utg. af Svenska Vitterhetssamfundet. I. Then swänska Argus. Hæfte iv. 9 kr. 25. III. E. J. Stagnelius, Samlade skrifter III, v, 2. 11 kr. and 6 kr. IV. Lucidor, Samlade dikter, udg. av F. Sandwall. Hæfte i. 10 kr. Stockholm, A. Bonnier.

Vries, J. de, Studiën over faerösche balladen. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 2 fl. 50.

Wingren, G., Svensk dramatisk litteratur under aaren 1840–1913. Bibliografisk förteckning. Uppsala, F. C. Askerberg. 6 kr.

Dutch.

Beatrijs. A Middle Dutch Legend. Edited with a grammatical Introduction, Notes and a Glossary by A. J. Barnouw. London, H. Milford. 6*s.* net.

Poelhekke, M. A. P. C., en C. G. N. de Vooys, Platenatlas bij de Nederlandsche literaturgeschiedenis. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 2 fl. 50.

Prinsen, J. L., Handboek tot de Nederlandsche letterkundige geschiedenis. I. Afl. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 1 fl. 25.

Van den vos Reinaerde. Naar de thans bekende handschriften en bewerkingen critisch uitgegeven door J. W. Muller. (Koninklijke Vlaamsche Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde.) Ghent, W. Siffer. 1 fl. 50.

English.

(*a*) *General (incl. Linguistic).*

Cruse, A., English Literature through the Ages: Beowulf to Stevenson. London, G. G. Harrap. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. v. Collected by O. Elton. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

Mackenzie, A. S., History of English Literature. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

Roberts, R. G., The Place-Names of Sussex. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10*s.* net.

Wilson, Sir J., The Dialect of the New Forest in Hampshire (as spoken in the Village of Burley). (Publications of the Philological Society, IV.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wyld, H. C., A Short History of English. With a Bibliography of recent books on the subject. London, Murray. 6*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Baldwin, C. S., Introduction to English Medieval Literature. London, Longmans. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Beowulf, with the Finnsburg Fragment. Edited by A. J. Wyatt. New Edition by R. W. Chambers. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9*s.* net.

Chaucer, G., Complete Poetical Works. Now first put into modern English by J. S. P. Tatlock and P. MacKaye. London, Macmillan. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Chaucer, G., Works. Edited by H. N. MacCracken. London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Map, W., De Nugis Curialium. Edited by M. R. James. (Anecdota Oxoniensia.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 18*s.* 6*d.* net.

Spurgeon, C. F. E., Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion (1357–1900). Part I. Text (1357–1800). (Chaucer Society, 2nd Series, XLVIII.) London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

Tatlock, J. S. P., The Scene of the Franklin's Tale visited. (Chaucer Society.) London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Ackermann, A., Der Seelenglaube bei Shakespeare. Eine mythologisch-literarwissenschaftliche Abhandlung. Frauenfeld, Huber. 3 fr. 50.

Addison, J., Essays. Chosen and edited with a preface by Sir J. G. Frazer. 2 vols. (Eversley Series.) London, Macmillan. 8*s.* net.

Addison, J., Miscellaneous Works. Edited by A. C. Guthkelch. Vol. I. London, G. Bell. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Bell, A. F., Leaders of English Literature. London, G. Bell. 2*s.* net.

Berger, P., William Blake: his Mysticism and Poetry. Transl. by D. H. Conner. London, Chapman and Hall.

Braithwaite, W. S., The Book of Restoration Verse. London, Duckworth. 6*s.* net.

Cambridge History of English Literature, The. Vol. XI. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9*s.* net.

Caxton, W., The Mirrour of the World. Edited by O. H. Prior. (Early English Text Society, Extra Series, CX.) London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. 15*s.* net.

Cecchi, E., Storia della letteratura inglese nel sec. XIX. Vol. I. Milan, Treves. 4 L.

Cowley, A., Essays and other Prose Writings. Edited by A. B. Gough. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Elton, O., Poetic Romancers after 1850. (British Academy.) London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net.

Esdaile, A., A Chronological List of G. Meredith's Publications, 1849–1911. London, A. Constable. 6*s.* net.

Fansler, H. E., The Evolution of Technic in Elizabethan Tragedy. Chicago, Row, Peterson & Co.

Farquhar, G., A Discourse upon Comedy, The Recruiting Officer and The Beaux Stratagem. Ed. by L. A. Strauss. (Belles Lettres Series.) London, G. G. Harrap. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Flew, J., Studies in Browning. Dublin, C. H. Kelly. 10*d.* net.

Forsythe, R. S., The Relations of Shirley's Plays to the Elizabethan Drama. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) London, H. Milford. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gayley, C. M., F. Beaumont, Dramatist: a Portrait. London, W. Duckworth. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Harmer, F. E., Select English Historical Documents of the 9th and 10th Centuries. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6*s.* net.

Jacke Jugeler, edited with Introduction and Notes by W. H. Williams. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jaggard, W., Stratford-on-Avon from a Student's Standpoint. Stratford-on-Avon, Shakespeare Press. 1*s.*

James, H., Notes on Novelists: with some other Notes, 1914. London, J. M. Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Johnson, R. B., Famous Reviews, selected and edited. London, I. Pitman. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Keynes, G., The Bibliography of John Donne. (Baskerville Club.) London, B. Quaritch. 15*s.* net.

Longfellow, H. W., Poetical Works. London, H. Milford. 5*s.* net.

McKerrow, R. B., Notes on Bibliographical Evidence for Literary Students and Editors of English Works of the 16th and 17th Centuries. London, Blades, East and Blades.

Maclean, C. M., Alexander Scott, Montgomerie, and Drummond of Hawthornden as Lyric Poets. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.* net.

Meredith, G., Poetical Works. Standard Edition. London, A. Constable. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Minot, L., Poems, ed. by J. Hall. 3rd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Mitford, M. R., Correspondence with C. Bonner and J. Ruskin. Edited by E. Lee. London, F. Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Morris, W., The Life and Death of Jason. Edited by E. Maxwell. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Pemberton, H., Shakespeare and Sir Walter Raleigh. London, Lippincott. 6*s.* net.

Rand, B., The Correspondence of George Berkeley and Sir John Percival. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9*s.* net.

Representative English Comedies. III. The later Contemporaries of Shakespeare. London, Macmillan. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rickert, E., Ancient English Christmas Carols, 1400–1700. Collected and arranged. London, Chatto and Windus. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Schelling, F. E., English Drama. London, J. M. Dent. 5*s.* net.

Stewart, C. D., Some textual Difficulties in Shakespeare. London, H. Milford. 6*s.* net.

Stopes, C. C., Shakespeare's Environment. London, G. Bell. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Swift, J., Correspondence. VI. Edited by F. E. Ball. London, G. Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Swinnerton, F., R. L. Stevenson: a critical study. London, M. Secker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Thompson, E. N. S., Essays on Milton. New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press (London, H. Milford). 6*s.* net.

Turnbull, A., Life and Writings of Alfred Lord Tennyson. (Great Writers.) London, W. Scott. 1*s.* net.

Walker, H., The English Essay and Essayists. London, J. M. Dent. 5*s.* net.

Wright, T., Isaac Watts and contemporary Hymn-writers. (Lives of British Hymn-Writers, III.) London, C. J. Farncombe. 5*s.* net.

Wynne, A., The Growth of English Drama. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Young, F. E. B., Robert Bridges: a critical study. London, M. Secker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*Linguistic*).

Diekoff, T., The German Language: outlines of its development. London, H. Milford. 5*s.* net.

Fischer, H., Schwäbisches Wörterbuch. Vol. IV. Tübingen, Laupp. 45 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Brans, R., Das Reichenauer Glossar Rf nebst seinen näheren Verwandten, Bib. 9. and Bib. 12. (Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sprachgeschichte, V.) Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M.

Gülzow, E., Zur Stilkunde der Krone Heinrichs von dem Türlin (Teutonia, XVIII). Leipzig, Haessel. 6 M.

Holder, A., Die Reichenauer Handschriften beschrieben und erläutert. II. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 24 M.

Lucidarius. Aus der Berliner Handschrift, herausg. von F. Heidlauf. Berlin, Weidmann. 6 M.

Seifrits Alexandergedicht. Aus der Strassburger Handschrift herausg. von R. Gercke. Berlin, Weidmann. 4 M.

Tegernseer Spiel vom deutschen Kaisertum und vom Antichrist, Das. Übersetzt von F. Vetter. Munich, D. Callwey. 1 M. 50.

Väterbuch, Das. Aus der Leipziger, Hildesheimer und Strassburger Handschrift, herausg. von K. Reissenberger. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, XXII.) Berlin, Weidmann. 23 M.

Werner der Schweizer, Das Marienleben. Aus der Heidelberger Hs. herausg. von M. Päpke. Berlin, Weidmann. 8 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Boenigk, O. von, Das Urbild von Goethes Gretchen. Greifswald, Bamberg. 2 M. 75.

Borvitz, W., Die Übersetzungstechnik Heinrich Steinhöwels. (Hermaea, xiii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M.

Brandes, G., Wolfgang Goethe. 1.—3. Hefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. Each 1 kr.

Brandl, W., Sebastian Wild, ein Augsburger Meistersinger. (Forschungen zu neueren Literaturgeschichte, xlviii.) Weimar, Duncker. 8 M.

Brentano, C., Werke, herausg. von M. Preitz. 3 vols. Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 6 M.

Förster-Nietzsche, E., The Lonely Nietzsche. Transl. by P. V. Cohn. London, W. Heinemann. 15*s.* net.

Gabetti, G., A. Platen e la bellezza come ideale morale. Genua, A. F. Formiggini. 2 L.

Goethe, J. W. von, Briefwechsel mit J. W. Döbereiner, herausg. von J. Schiff. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 3 M. 90.

Gräf, H. G., Goethe über seine Dichtungen. iii. Teil, ii. Bd., 2. Frankfort, Rütten und Löning. 21 M. 50.

Hauff, W., Werke. i, ii. Munich, G. Müller. Each 8 M.

Horowitz, J., Der Toleranzgedanke in der deutschen Literatur zur Zeit Moses Mendelssohns. Stuttgart, W. Spemann. 1 M. 50.

Kern, O., Johann Rist als weltlicher Lyriker. Marburg, Elwert. 6 M.

Ludwig, O., Sämtliche Werke, herausg. von P. Merker. iii, vi. Munich, G. Müller. Each 6 M.

Luther, M., Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe xxxi, l, li. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 24 M., 26 M. 20, 23 M.

Pizzo, E., Milton's Verlornes Paradies im deutschen Urteile des 18. Jahrh. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, liv.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M.

Porterfield, A. W., An Outline of German Romanticism. Boston, Ginn and Co. 1 dol.

Schulze, W., G. Schwab als Balladendichter. (Palaestra, cxxvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 50.

Semper, M., Die geologischen Studien Goethes. Leipzig, Veit und Co. 9 M.

Storm, T., Briefe an seine Braut. Herausg. von G. Storm. Brunswick, G. Westermann. 6 M.

Uhland, L., Briefwechsel. Herausg. von J. Hartmann. iii. (Schwäbischer Schillerverein.) Stuttgart, Cotta. 7 M. 50.

Volksbuch vom Doktor Faust, Das. Nach der um die Erfurter Geschichten vermehrten Fassung herausg. von J. Fritz. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M.

Wagnervolksbuch, Das, im 18. Jahrhundert, herausg. von J. Fritz. (Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrh., cl.) Berlin, Behr. 2 M. 40.

Willoughby, L. A., Samuel Naylor and 'Reynard the Fox': a study in Anglo-German literary relations. London, H. Milford. 1*s.* net.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

VOLUME X JULY, 1915 NUMBER 3

THE WELSH 'TROILUS AND CRESSIDA' AND ITS RELATION TO THE ELIZABETHAN DRAMA.

In the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth is an unpublished and virtually unknown Welsh verse interlude on Troilus and Cressida[1]. Even a reader with little knowledge of Welsh quickly sees that the whole work is of some interest to students of English literary history, and that one scene near the beginning is of unusual interest to them. Accordingly, the late Mr H. Brython Hughes made for me a close translation of the first forty-six pages, and summarized the rest; and Mr E. Stanton Roberts of Aberystwyth has revised the translation and afforded me much other information[2].

The manuscript is a medium-sized thick volume with two hundred and thirty-one paper pages of text. There are large ornate capitals, and to one not well acquainted with Welsh paleography the hand looks medieval, though it was prodigal of spaces and margins. The work bears no original title. Throughout most of its five books the speakers are named in red, and there are occasional statements of the action and summaries of the story, also generally in red. The fourth and fifth books (only) are preceded by rather full summaries of contents. Beginning on p. 40 the rubrications cease,—*i.e.*, names of speakers, most of the personal names in the text, statements of action and part of the summaries,—recommencing on p. 114; from the lower part of p. 78 to p. 88 the text is a complete blank, and there are one or two other blanks. Therefore two-thirds of the first half of the play are difficult

[1] The MS. is called Peniarth 106 (formerly Hengwrt 338). One or two people have glanced at it, that seems to be all; the work has been mentioned here and there. Dr J. Gwenogvryn Evans in the *Report on Welsh MSS.* of the Historical MSS. Commission prints a brief description, with the first 14 lines and the last rubric in Welsh (1899, vol. I, pt ii, pp. 651–2; cf. also p. v). It is also noticed by J. O. Halliwell-Phillips, having been shown him by Mr Wynne, a former owner; see his *Notes on Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida,'* of which only 20 copies were printed; it is mentioned by Anatole le Braz, *Le théatre celtique* (Paris, 1904), p. 64, and by C. Wilkins, *History of the Literature of Wales*, p. 215.

[2] It is pleasant also to thank Mr John Ballinger the librarian, and Mr Richard Ellis, of the National Library staff, for many courtesies.

to follow for one not already familiar with the story (though perfectly easy for one who is). On p. 119, at the end of Book III, appears this rubric: 'And thus ends this part of this book, Wednesday, the 14th day of the month of February in the year of Christ's age 1613[1].' On p. 160 is this rubric: 'And thus ends the fourth book of this history, the eleventh day of the month of September in the year of Christ's age 1622.' On p. 231 is the rubric: 'And thus ends the fifth book and the last of this history, the fifth day of the month of October in the year of Christ 1622.'

Though the name of the copyist is not given, the handwriting is recognized[2] as that of a man well known to students of early Welsh, John Jones of Gelli Lyfdy, in the parish of Ysceifiog, Flintshire. At a time when there was not a printing-press in Wales, through a period of forty years and more he was busy copying manuscripts, thus saving monuments of the past from extinction; and scores of his copies are extant, mostly in the Peniarth collection, now in the National Library. More than this, we can trace the history of the manuscript with simplicity and fair certainty. There is a probable tradition that John Jones and Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt (1592–1666), another lover of

[1] One might expect that it would be just after this that the rubrications would recommence, instead of five pages earlier.

[2] By persons familiar with the Peniarth MSS.—Dr Gwenogvryn Evans, Mr Ellis, Mr Roberts, etc. Cf. Hist. MSS. Comm., *Report on Welsh MSS.* I, ii, p. 651. In MS. Peniarth 307 (written in 1639) is his copy-book of model letters (*ibid.* I, iii, p. 1111). On John Jones see Gwenogvryn Evans (*ibid.* I, iii, pp. iv f.); *Charter and Report of the Nat. Libr. of Wales* (Oswestry, 1909), pp. 47–8; C. Wilkins, *Hist. of the Lit. of Wales*, pp. 182, 218; R. Williams, *Biogr. Dict. of Eminent Welshmen*, p. 258; William Owen [Pughe], *Cambrian Biography*, p. 207; Edward Lhuyd, *Archaeologia Brittanica* (Oxford, 1707), p. 258; *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5th series, index. Welsh scholars justly animadvert on his omission from the *Dictionary of National Biography*. MSS. written by him mentioned in the *Report on Welsh MSS.* number over 70, variously dated from 1603 to 1645. He is said to have been an attorney in the Court of the Marches of Wales; but he passed some of his later years in the Fleet prison in London, where he was by no means idle. MSS. copied 'yn y fflut y Ngaerlud' are dated only between 1634 and 1641. He was recommitted to the Fleet in January, 1653–4, and was still there in July, 1655, the last we hear of him, when he was probably 70 or over, having begun his scribal activities as early as 1603 (*Rep. on W. MSS.* I, iii, p. 1121). Between 1641 and 1654 he was evidently at liberty at least part of the time (*ibid.*). This last incarceration seems to have been a consequence of business troubles which began in January, 1637–8 (p. 1120). The cause of the earlier is not apparent, unless he had been addicted to some such 'reflections on the mal-administration of justice, the barbarities of the Fleete prison, the Justice of the comon pleas of Wales, the Channcery courte of Justice, the Counsell of the Marches of Wales Goverment' as he included in MS. Peniarth 315, in which he tells in English of his troubles (p. 1121), for some of these indiscretions were commonly atoned for in the Fleet (cf. J. Ashton, *The Fleet*, London, 1888, pp. 263–4). Apparently in his day it was not regarded as a notably pleasant prison, as it was in 1708 (*ibid.*). The John Jones who was among 'the porest prisoners in the Wardes' of the Fleet in 1597 can hardly have been he (*Oeconomy of the Fleete*, by Alexander Harris, Camden Soc. 1879, p. 164); nor John Jones a learned Benedictine friend of Abp Laud (Wilkins, p. 173). James Howell (1594?–1666), the author of the *Familiar Letters*, was another Welshman who did much of his work in the Fleet prison (1643–51).

the Welsh past, agreed that whichever died first should leave his MSS. to the other, and that Jones' earlier death allowed his to go to the Hengwrt collection. This passed in 1859 from Vaughan's descendant Sir Robert W. Vaughan, Bart., to his friend Mr W. W. E. Wynne, of Peniarth, Merionethshire, on the death of whose son in 1909 it went to the National Library of Wales[1].

The poem begins: 'Ye gracious company, the reason of my coming here is to show the sadness of the son of the king of Troy; the manner in which he bore the long affliction of love and sadness, and the manner in which this turned into joy and his joy to gloom' (based on Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, I. 1–5)[2]. Then follows an invocation to Tisiphone, an appeal to lovers for their prayers, and an account of the situation and a summary of the work—the coming of the Greeks, Kalkas' escape and desertion of Kressyd, and Troelws' love of her (all closely translating Chaucer, I. 7–68, summarizing 78–94, and adding almost nothing); the introduction ends with Kressyd's departure, infidelity and wretched end (from Henryson), and with ten lines of moralizing. In the first scene Kalkas debates in soliloquy whether to leave Troy or to stay, calls his servant Sinon, and ceremonially consults Apollo, who replies that Troy shall fall (pp. 6–12). Priam debates in council with six lords whether to return Helen to the Greeks (pp. 12–22, 36–38). Kressyd is accused by Sinon of treason, fetched before this council, and saved from death by Hector and Troelws (pp. 22–36). 'Upon this,' we are told, with no great dramatic subtlety (p. 38), 'Troelws fell in deep love with Kressyd.' Then (pp. 39–58) comes Troelws' song and soliloquy (here we return to Chaucer, I. 400–529), Pandar's entrance, and their dialogue (552 ff.)[3].

The second book (pp. 61–78) follows the first part of Chaucer's second, with his proem, Pandar's visit to Kressyd, his disclosure of Troelws' love, and her reproach of him for tempting her. Here comes a break of over ten pages. When the text recommences, after what

[1] See *Charter and Report of the Library*, pp. 43, 47; Hist. MSS. Comm., *Rep. on W. MSS.*, I. ii, p. v; Robert Williams, *Biogr. Dict. of Eminent Welshmen* (Llandovery, 1852), pp. 258, 511; W. F. Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, I, 1, 2; *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, *s.v.* Robert Vaughan; *Arch. Britt.*, p. 254.

[2] In the course of my summary I give the corresponding lines of Chaucer's poem, which (to anticipate) is the main source.

[3] Here follows a blank of over two pages. P. 58 (according to Mr Roberts) translates st. 151, close to the end of Chaucer's bk I, and seems meant to terminate the first book in the Welsh. P. 61 contains st. 1 of Chaucer's second book. Pp. 59, 60, and the top of 61 are blank, save for a decorated capital A on p. 59. What is omitted is undoubtedly the prose summary of book II, such as we find preceding bks IV and V; omitted no doubt because left for rubrication.

must be a large loss[1], we find ourselves in the third book, at the beginning of Troelws' interview with Kressyd (in Deiphebus' house in Chaucer); the most intense scene in this part seems to be given somewhat indirectly; the book ends with the exchange of thanks and admonition between the two men, and with Troelws' rapturous song to love (III. 1597–1771).

The fourth book closely follows Chaucer's fourth, as appears from the following summary on pp. 120–1: 'At this time it happened that the Greeks, being constantly fighting under the walls of Troy, caught Antenor, one of the Trojan lords, a prisoner. At this a great longing stirred Kalkas for his daughter Kressyd; he feared that some calamity should befall the town of Troy, all of a sudden, wherein he should lose his daughter; and he fell on his knees before Agamemnon, and others of the kings of Greece, and begged that Antenor be given him to offer in exchange for Kressyd, and he showed the great good-will he had for them, so that he got his wish. And now Diomedes was sent to Troy to find out whether King Priaf would consent to the exchange, who agreed to it [?]. It was Diomedes that conducts Antenor to Troy, and brings Kressyd thence. Troelws is in great trouble now, for fear he [she ?] should be compelled to depart; but at last he made an agreement, that Kressyd should miss the tenth night from amongst the Greeks and come to Troy. And of this the fourth book treats[2].'

The fifth book follows Chaucer's fifth till near the end of the latter, then switches to Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*, as the summary which heads it will show (pp. 161–4): 'Diomedes brings Antenor to Troy, and brings Kressyd with him to the Greeks, and on the way she [?] pretends to love him: Troelws marvels that she departs from her promise. Diomedes is close upon winning the favour of Kressyd; Troelws dreams

[1] The text just before the break (p. 78), according to Mr Roberts, translates II, 414–420 in Chaucer, and just after the break translates III, 62–3; that is, almost 1400 of Chaucer's lines are omitted, describing Criseyde's resolution to love Troilus, and Pandarus' elaborate schemes to induce her to see, write to and meet her lover, etc. There is probably also omitted a rubricated summary of the third book, such as precedes the two later ones. Before and after this break the Welsh has followed the English rather closely (omitting comparatively little) at the rate of somewhere about 20 English lines to a page of the Welsh. At the same rate the blank should correspond to only two or three hundred English lines instead of fourteen hundred. This would indicate that there had been a loss in John Jones' original, many times as great as he in his unfamiliarity with the story supposed and allowed for.

[2] This translation and the next are by Mr Hughes alone; the rest by Mr Roberts, slightly altered. The summary is written in John Jones' later hand (cf. p. 281 below), which begins again for good on p. 136. The same is true of the rubricated parts, and unrubricated proper names, on pp. 122–135 (apparently not of the rubrics on pp. 114–121; my authority for all this is Mr Roberts). Therefore when John Jones resumed his copying after a lapse of years he made some attempt to fill in the blanks he had previously left.

and sends to fetch Kassandra, his sister, in order to interpret the dream, and she declares that Diomedes had won Kressyd, and he packs her off, and then in fighting Deiphobus...[?]...to Troy the cloak of Diomedes, and on considering the request [?] Troelws sees the jewel he had given to Kressyd when leaving inserted in her [the ?] collar, and he knows that Kressyd is unfaithful to him. Diomedes is afraid that some of the Greeks are on friendly terms with her, and he drives her out of his sight, and commands that she never come again where he was. On this Kressyd cries out against the gods, then Cupid rings a silver bell and calls the gods together, and they take away her comeliness from her and strike her with leprosy and great poverty, and at last she goes among the lepers, so that thereby she is living on charity. Troelws passes by on his way from the war, the wretches beg his charity, whilst he looks on and likes her looks without knowing her, and gives her all that he had with him. At that she asks one of the wretches who he was, and he tells her it was Troelws; at this she breaks her heart, seeing his kindness, and out of true repentance for her unfaithfulness towards him. He was exceedingly sorrowful when he heard this, and he had her buried like a highborn lady: and from that time forth he also resigned himself to die in the war, and so he comes to his end, but as long as he lived he never forgot her: and so ends the pitiful history of Troelws and Kressyd.'

Next I give in full the two first and most original scenes of the play.

(p. 6) 'Sc. 1. *Kalkas* (soliloquizing). Sad, yea, too sad is the thought, which to my heart is like a goad. It doth not suffer me to sleep, nor give me ease to forbear; great anxiety does me no good, I bear up of necessity. Who could be joyful who had to conduct such a bargain; knowing not which is better, to go or to stay at home? My country is the land of Asia, my dwelling-place is in the town of Troy. (p. 7) My relations, my companions, and all my beloved friends, they and myself on the one part dwell in the same place; myself being lord over them, with the rank of duke or king, their bulwark through veritable justice, their respect, their chief and their trust. I myself know not my riches, my elevation nor my sovereignty; and on this account the world smiles upon me. If succour comes not in good time, all this will have been of no avail. All Greece is in arms, with Troy she is angry; the cause is known, everybody is aware of it, and the gods will not suffer the doing of too many transgressions. (p. 8) Though

Hector be so brave, Eneas and Antenor, though Troelws is so valiant, and the sons of king Priaf, though there are men as valiant in Troy-town as ever were born, some of the Greeks are as brave as any men can be, and all the strength of the war certainly consists in having a just cause. For this reason my conscience accuses them of sin; the sin of the faithless and their vanity will be overcome, and in the end justice will conquer. If I stay and fight on the side of the people of Troy, and defend their sin against my conscience, (p. 9) a day will come at last when the full vengeance will be brought, when the fire so cruelly will burn fair Troy, and the blood of men in streams will fill all her streets. There will be no time there to meditate what will be the best thing to do.—If I abandon my faith, my country, my privileges, my wealth, my family, my companions, and go over to the enemy, what will be said of me but "Falseness will destroy him"? And the Greeks will say, "He who has betrayed his own country without a doubt will betray us also if we give him credence." And for this reason in Apollo will I put my trust; (p. 10) and those things which he commands I will set my mind upon doing. Sinon, fetch thou for me clear water to sacrifice, and bring fillets here to encompass the altars; let frankincense be ready, mix it with the wormwood; light thou the fire in them, and go away from them. Threads of three colours are wanted here. Apollo rejoices in the wheel of numbers.—Apollo, what is best, to go or to remain at home?—Apollo, thy reply has caused the moon to become reversed, and it was through thee, Apollo, that Syrse (p. 11) was working. Apollo, what is best, to go, or remain at home? It was through thee also that Medea got all her skill. It was through thee that Enon obtained knowledge and signs, and it is through thee that Kassandra prophesies to Troy. Apollo, what is the best thing to do? To go, or to remain at home? Thou didst turn the rivers to flow counter to the steeps. Thou didst make the sea, Apollo, so that it neither flows nor ebbs. Apollo, which shall be destroyed, the Trojans or the Greeks?

Sinon hereupon comes.

(p. 12) '*Apollo.* The Trojans will be conquered and the town of Troy will be won; this town will be entirely burnt, with losses to the Greeks.'

Sc. 2. 'Priaf calls together Hector, Paris, Eneas, Antenor, Helenws and Troelws to tell their opinions, which was better, to give back Helen or not.

(p. 13) '*Priaf.* My sons, my lords, and my confident company, in

your counsel and your action is my entire trust. There are threescore kings ready to oppose us, every hour expecting to burn all our lands and towns, and to destroy in the end ourselves, our children and our wives, the whole cause being that Helen chose you, Paris. Your counsel, which is better, to restore Helen, (p. 14) and depart from sorrow, and live free from care, or through violence retain her and ever invite their worst, and live as may be possible in spite of the threats of the Greeks? I pray you declare what you wish to do. You say first, Hector, what is your opinion and your counsel?

'*Hector.* I am, my honourable king, obedient to your command. It is not reasonable for the [Greeks], through their wile and wisdom (p. 15) and their menacing and black words, to obtain whatever they desire. They are but strangers, it is easy enough to repel them. My opinion and my resolute counsel, they shall get only what they win. Sir Paris, do you choose, either war or peace.

'*Paris.* My beloved, righteous king, my brothers, and my companions, by your counsel and will I have made my choice; and that will I maintain in spite of the Greeks and their worst. (p. 16) It is easy for them to talk, in their ostentation and their raiment; their boastful words will have been forgotten before they wear their white armour. All their vaingloriousness and their religion they utter by rote. Eneas, favour us with your opinion about the question of peace.

'*Eneas.* Ye royal company, we have no need to fear, though kings have come hither across seas to beseech the restoration of Helen in peace to her owner. (p. 17) Should this not be done, they will not precipitate a fight and become rash for the sake of a jealous husband. It was her husband's wish that was the sole cause of this [warlike] assemblage. My opinion and my counsel you, Antenor, know.

'Antenor's reply follows on leaf 37, because it was omitted here inadvertently.

'*Helenws.* My natural father and my king, all this is against us. The things which we should do in order to save our lives, and not to offend our men, and to live as we have been doing, (p. 18) are[1] to restore Helen to the loser who owns her, in order that we may obtain our peace, our ease and our freedom from care, and let the strangers go back along the same way. Think, let your wisdom be exercised. If we were to conquer the [Greeks], there is nothing to be got except the possession of Helen, and that could not be done without the loss of some on both sides. An excellent gain that, getting an unnatural lady

[1] Reading *yw* for *a*.

who would sell her own husband in order to lead a life of sin, who would follow strangers, and renounce her place of birth! Her thought is vanity and her whole mind is set on lasciviousness. (p. 19) It cannot be but that adversity will come from long pursuing adultery. My opinion and my advice is to give everyone his due. Troelws, my beloved brother, defend not sin.

'*Troelws.* My gracious father, my exalted king, my fellow-warriors, lead ye my brother Helenws to his companion Menelaws; he talks similarly, and his manner is like that of a gentleman who had had the palms of both hands anointed with oil. (p. 20) The ointment as eloquence savours on his tongue. He does not see the harm though there should be long bondage. Our aunt Hesione is as good a woman as she [Helen?] is[1]. Let us make up our minds, let us not believe him entirely who presages the worst concerning the age and nation of Troy. Let us cling to what we hold; welcome to the fortune of war.

'*Priaf.* My defenders against my affliction through your wisdom and your valour, (p. 21) to my old age there is joy through your everlasting praise. My harmonious faithful ones, and my confident trusted ones, your accordant words have awakened my heart to express my willingness to comply with your compact. And do you give no heed to the opinions of Helenws. He, assuredly, was born beneath some weaker planet, so that he is not so strong in mind and action as are Hector, Troelws and Antenor. Because of the wrong which they did to my sister Hesione, I will keep Helen within the walls of Troy, (p. 22) and let her choose either Menelaws or Paris.

'Kalkas left his only daughter behind when he fled to the Greeks. She was called Kressyd. At that time she had not her peer in virtues and beauty. The Trojans had a law that whoever should be a traitor to his country or his king, his next of kin should be condemned to die the most cruel death that could be imagined; whereby Kressyd was liable to lose her life. And as Priaf was about (p. 23) to rise from the senate which was held about restoring Helen, Sinon, Kalkas' servant, announced the departure of his master to the Greeks, and accused Kressyd, in order that he might escape from trouble.

'*Sinon.* If it please your grace, the lord Kalkas fled suddenly last night to associate with the Greeks. My lords, you must be on the watch lest you be deceived by being trustful. The only daughter and

[1] This must be the meaning of 'Y modryb *Hesione* sydd gystal merch a hithe.' According to the version of the Troy-saga current in the Elizabethan drama (and according to Caxton's *Recuyell*), the abduction of Priam's sister Hesione by the Greeks was the excuse for that of Helen by Paris. Probably the 'long bondage' refers to Hesione's.

beloved of Kalkas is Kressyd. (p. 24) She does not take to heart either her loss or his wickedness. The likelihood is that she knew of his departure.

'*Priaf.* Depart hastily, fetch the traitor's only daughter to receive punishment for concealing treachery.

'*Priaf* (turning towards his sons). Unless, my sons, these things are examined ruthlessly, (p. 25) unless the fire which has flared up so readily be extinguished in time, there will be seen too many traitors. We must inflict extreme punishment for this, or else I am afraid there will be too much wickedness, and Helenws will be seen saying the unpalatable truth.

'*Kressyd* (coming with Sinon and falling on her knees). My gracious lords, you sent to fetch me (p. 26) in anger and indignation; I fear opposition.

'*Priaf.* Art thou the only daughter of Kalkas, the froward old churl, who would sell all his privileges at the end of his old age, in order to be treacherous towards his honourable country, and to go into bondage among strangers? Thy conscience and thy behaviour accuse thee of falsity, and guilty art thou of all his wickedness. (p. 27) Through his great offence and outrage his nation will he destroy. With thee first of all, Kressyd, will it begin. Thy blood, thy life, thy penance, thy great pain and thy cruel death will ease my heart. What say you, my lords? What death shall we inflict upon her?

'*Paris.* Lead her to be burnt, because of her falsity and evil, and that till she be dead; execute the law.

'(p. 28) *Eneas.* Cause her to be thrown into a deep dark pit; it is too mild to burn her for such wickedness.

'*Antenor.* Throw her to-night into the cave to the lions; she will be enough food for one meal for the hungry lions.

'(p. 29) *Helenws.* Send her to a prison to bear oppression and sorrow, pining while her life lasts within her prison.

'*Hector.* Conduct [her] to the Greeks after the old traitor. Let her go where she will, she can do no great harm.

'(p. 30) *Troelws.* Take not vengeance upon the innocent for the transgression of the guilty one, and be not too cruel; she may be innocent.

'*Kressyd.* My merciful lords, be not too desirous to shed innocent blood for the wrong and the faults of another person. If Kalkas caused you pain, Kressyd was without malice. (p. 31) He guilty of the charge, and I innocent, the father committing a wrong and the daughter bearing

the vengeance—that is too odious a law, exceedingly contrary to your dignity. Had he informed me of his wily and deceitful treachery, I should not be remaining in custody in the midst of war, nor would there be warriors passing so incessantly the place where I am. I being the only maiden, a woman cannot but accuse [? *i.e.*, I am only a woman, and a woman cannot be trusted]. He knew, my lords, that he cannot confide in me, and it was that which caused him so suddenly to depart. Woe is me that my life, though it suffered languishment and great agony, (p. 32) were not quite able to undo that awful deed, and that, though it should remain, none of my kin should be upbraided with the cause. My lords, I would not desire you now to pardon me.

'*Troelws* (speaking low in the ear of Hector his brother). Hector, my dear brother, protector of the innocent and piteous, I implore your highness to protect the truth. Protect Kressyd, her life and her existence.

'(p. 33) *Hector*. You show charity in listening to tearful lamentation, and in taking compassion upon the complaint of the innocent maiden. Had she been aware of his deceitful departure, it would be natural that she should keep secret those things which, through great agony, would have cost her father his life. Should there be such cruelty, what will the enemies say? Where there is such cruelty, there cannot be bravery.

'(p. 34) *Troelws* (—and hereupon he falls in love). I will give my life for her, if she did any wrong, or if she was ever addicted to deceit or falsity. We beseech you to grant her forgiveness; and from this hour forth I Troelws myself put my freedom into captivity for the sincerity of Kressyd.

'(Troelws turns to Sinon who had accused her, and whispers to him.) Thou filthy liar, prone to every accusation, (p. 35) thy boastful practice ever is to spread falsehoods, and to incriminate an innocent person by means of malicious inventions, and to excuse iniquity and a faulty manner of life, in order to wag thy tail to all sorts of men. Were it not that my natural father is present, by all the gods I would transfix thee with my sword.

'*Priaf*. I will not oppose your desire, though I lose the country of Asia. (p. 36) Go, Kressyd, innocent, and give thanks to my sons. Let us go in to meditate what more there is to be done.

'*Hector* (to Kressyd, after the others have left). Go forth home, be not greatly oppressed, take your freedom and your life joyfully; and to the utmost of my power put your trust in me.

'Most noble reader, it happened that through some unseen carelessness I omitted Antenor's reply (p. 37) to Priaf's question to his council with respect to the heroic deed [?] of restoring Helen, which should have been written on leaf 17, after Eneas' reply and before Helenws'.

'*Antenor.* My gracious king and just, and all my royal companions, the chief reason of the strangers for coming is to see the splendour which belongs to our towns, our lands and our society; and this is the excuse—to ask for Helena. (p. 38) If she could be got easily by threatening us with war, a victory that would be considered by them. Helenws can speak with more skill.

'Turn back to Helenws' reply on leaf 17.'

From the point of view of literary and dramatic merit, so far as can be judged from my incomplete version, some but not much praise can be given to the work. The original shows a certain experience and skill in versification and style[1], and there are traces of humour and pathos; but few signs of beauty, power or originality of thought or manner come out in translation. In dramatic quality it is poorer yet. Its method of setting forth a state of things is not dramatic but narrative, sometimes clumsily so; it shows a little, but not much, attempt at characterization, and but little sense for a situation, or even for dramatic unity[2]. It is by a man of some literary experience, and a little literary and dramatic instinct, but no dramatic experience. If it was ever seriously meant to be acted, it must have been before a very primitive audience.

As to the authorship of the play there is but little light. It is pretty surely not by John Jones himself. He is scarcely known to have been an original author, certainly not of this kind of thing[3]. Among his vastly numerous copies, this is the chief one of purely literary

[1] Most of the verse is that called by students of Welsh 'semi-rhythmical,' *i.e.*, the lines have a fixed number of accented, but not of unaccented syllables; they generally rhyme in couplets. Mr Roberts refers to *Welsh Metrics*, by Professor J. Glyn Davies, of the University of Liverpool.

[2] Cf. p. 279 below. The author fails to reform two maladroit turns of the not very dextrous Henryson. The leprosy inflicted on Kressyd is a punishment, not for the infidelity which is the subject of the play, but for the almost pardonable blasphemy against the gods which she has just uttered. When Troelws passes Kressyd among the lepers, she does not recognize him, and asks who he is; which is unnatural and misses a dramatic opportunity.

[3] Of apparently original works I find only a short biographical dictionary (*Rep. on Welsh MSS.* I, ii, 1045), and a work on the bards and on writing (*ibid.*, II, ii, 720, in English). There may be others.

character[1]; the other works are mostly on traditional, historical, linguistic, legal, topographical, genealogical and religious subjects; nowhere else does he show an interest in ambitious poetry of a late and literary character unconnected with Wales. Further, a man copying his own play is unlikely to have made the omission of a speech noted above, and then to have corrected it in such an artless way; or to have left blank the ten pages 79–88, especially when the matter omitted would seemingly have required far more space; or to have spread the copying (the above errors and the scarcity of corrections show this was not a first draft) over almost ten years.

But even on the basis of this incomplete translation one can say some things about the author[2]. Some of his 'local colour' shows detailed information about the unreformed Church[3], which may excuse the guess that his life dated to near papal times. He seems, however, to betray hostility to the medieval faith when Paris sneers at the Greeks' religion, which 'they have by rote'[4]. Again, he knew English well, for I have detected few errors in his translation from the archaic Chaucer and the dialectic Henryson, which is often very close. Further, he had more or less (not over-accurate) classical learning[5]. Finally, I

[1] A few collections of short poems, such as *englynion*, copied by him, are mentioned in the *Report on Welsh MSS.* II, iv, 977; I, i, 87–97; 290; I, ii, 477, 664, 671, 689, 968, 1073, 1118–9.

[2] Mr Roberts says that the extreme and unnecessary freedom with which colloquial forms of words are used throughout shows that the author did not belong to the professional bardic class.

[3] He knew the composition of incense; 'Let frankincense be ready, mix it with the wormwood,' says Kalkas to Sinon (p. 10). I find no reference to *ἀψίνθιον*, *absinthium*, burned as a perfume among the ancients, but various bitter woods are used by Christians with frankincense. He knew the ceremonies at a priest's ordination. Cf. Troelws' taunt to his brother Helenws: 'His manner is like that of a gentleman who had had the palms of both hands anointed with oil' ('gwr bonheddic, A vydde wedi i elio Rhyd kledre i ddwy ddwylo'). Likewise in Caxton's *Recuyell* (ed. Sommer, p. 524) and Shakespeare's *Troilus*, II, ii, 37, Troilus taunts Helenus as a cowardly priest. Medieval pontificals direct unction to be applied to both the ordinand's hands; on the palms in the modern Roman rite, as I am told by those who ought to know, and as is plainly implied in the Roman pontifical. This is so minute a point that one might almost fancy that the author himself had been ordained by an unreformed bishop.

[4] P. 16: 'I gwchder oll ai krefydd Sydd ar i tafod lyferydd.' There is no sense in this as applied by a Trojan to the Greek religion.

[5] He quotes the reply (p. 5, 'none to be counted happy till his death') 'that Solon gave to the impatient rich man,' Croesus: *ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ εἶρεό με, οὔκω σε ἐγὼ λέγω, πρὶν τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι* (Herodotus, I, 32). The Greek form 'Diomedes' is substituted for Chaucer's 'Diomede' (though his curious plural 'Parcas,' *T. and C.* v. 3, is retained—'Parkas,' p. 165). Kalkas' rites in consulting Apollo, notoriously the god of prophecy, show reading. Sinon is to fetch 'clear water to sacrifice'; lustration required running or sea water, not water from a lake or pond (cf. Virgil's *Æneid*, II, 719; Euripides, *Electra*, 793–4; *Iph. in Taur.* 1039, 1193), but the author was probably vaguer in his information. The 'fillets to encompass the altars,' and the 'threads of three colours' (p. 10), may be a vague recollection of the 'vittae' and 'infulae' (the latter red and white), worn by priestesses and victims for sacrifice. 'Light thou the fire in them and go away from them' (the frankincense and wormwood, p. 10), says Kalkas to Sinon; the burning

shall show later a good reason for the statement that probably not far from 1600 the author had been where he could see English plays. On the basis of such points as these the author may one day be identified, if anyone thinks him worth identifying[1].

The sources of the poem are, as already indicated, easily made out. The starting-point and the guide nearly all through is Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, though much of it naturally is omitted, and throughout there seem to be small additions. At the end, we have seen, the play follows Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*; the principal changes seem to be that Kressyd shows her fickleness earlier, and that Diomedes casts her off because he suspects that she is faithless to him, not because he has tired of her. The author doubtless knew Henryson's poem in one of Thynne's, Stowe's or Speght's black-letter editions of Chaucer[2], in all of which it immediately follows the *Troilus*.

If this were all, the poem would be of little interest to students of English literature, or in fact to anyone except perhaps an ardent student of Welsh culture. But, as I have said, even a cursory inspection of the manuscript shows more than this. It is not so much that the first of the scenes here printed, and the latter part of the second, where Kalkas consults Apollo, and where Sinon betrays and Hector saves

of incense was important at sacrifices, and Sinon was certainly a fit object for Kalkas' 'Odi profanum vulgus et arceo' (if this is the meaning). Kalkas' invocation has classical reminiscences, with a list of sorceresses or prophetesses. 'Through thee, Apollo, Syrse [Circe, presumably] was working' (p. 10). I find no explanation of this except that Circe was a daughter of Helios. 'It was through thee that Enon obtained knowledge and signs' (p. 11); Apollo gave Oenone his mistress a knowledge of medicine and herbs (Ovid, *Heroides*, v, 145–8), and she had prophetic power from the gods (Parthenius of Nicaea, Περὶ Ἐρωτικῶν Παθημάτων, chap. 4, in Meineke's *Analecta Alexandrina*). Cassandra's gift of prophetic power from Apollo (p. 11) is well known. Kalkas says Apollo turned 'the rivers to flow counter to the steeps,' and made the sea 'so that it neither flows nor ebbs'; the former was familiar as a supposed magic feat (cf. Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, i, 3), the latter may possibly be a vague reminiscence of Chaucer's *Franklin's Tale*, 1055–62. Likewise Apollo's 'reply has caused the moon to become reversed' (p 10); the supposed effect of spells on the moon was familiar. 'It was through thee also that Medea got all her skill' (p. 11); any special connection of Medea with Apollo as patron of the occult is hard to find, though she is called granddaughter of Helios (*Odyssey*, x, 137; Apollodorus, i, ix, 1). The author seems to refer (p. 10) to some form of divination by a 'wheel of number' ('Mae Apolo yn llawenychy Yn y rhod rhifedy'); but I find nothing of the sort among the ancients, in Cicero's *De divinatione*, Macrobius, or elsewhere, except that the Greeks used a kind of wheel called the ἴυγξ for sorcery. In Chaucer he learns 'by calculinge,' 'by sort,' and by answer of Apollo (i, 71–6). All this rather pettifogging research among works most of which the author probably had not read reveals considerable but inaccurate knowledge of ancient usage and tradition.

[1] I find no promising candidate in such books as Wilkins' *History of the Literature of Wales*, Robert Williams' *Biogr. Dict. of Eminent Welshmen*, Hughes' *Hist. of the Church of the Cymry*, Williams' *Parliamentary Hist. of Wales* (from 1580 to 1610), William Owen [Pughe]'s *Cambrian Biography*. Most of these works are hopelessly vague and uncritical. Some of the following might possibly be worth considering, if we knew more about them—Thomas Jones (Wilkins, 182), John Owen (*ibid.*, 377), Edmund Price (415).

[2] Published 1532, 1542, 1545–50 (? n.d.); 1561; 1598, 1602. It was also printed separately in Edinburgh in 1593.

Kressyd, are not known elsewhere[1]; the council-of-war scene betrays clear influence of the Elizabethan drama. More yet, it is safe to say that the poem would probably never have been put in dramatic form at all without that influence.

The earlier Welsh took little more kindly to the drama than the Irish did; bardic tradition opposed it. In spite of the contentions of one or two patriotic Celts, there seems small doubt that the scanty Welsh drama is wholly due to English influence[2], as the very word for play, *enterlute*, *anterlwt*, indicates. Not one of the few plays extant earlier than ours (almost wholly in manuscript, the earliest manuscript seemingly of about 1550) probably antedates the sixteenth century[3]; all seem to be miracle-plays, or at least religious, except for a moral-satirical semi-secular interlude somewhat in the manner of John Heywood; and almost all are very short[4]. Therefore when we find a long wholly secular play, unique as such, mainly translated from an English poem, by a writer with little originality and no dramatic experience or skill, and on a subject a favourite in the Elizabethan drama[5], we are justified in suspecting not only a general but also this particular English influence.

There is more concrete evidence in the second of the scenes printed above, which is apparently the only scene suggested by nothing in Chaucer or Henryson, and which draws the play into relation with the Elizabethan dramas on Troilus and the Trojan war. Of these we have detailed knowledge of three, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, Thomas Heywood's *Iron Age*, and a play known in partial outline

[1] In Caxton's *Recuyell*, p. 551, Calchas has been sent by Priam to the 'yle of delphe' to consult Apollo as to the prospects of the war; the answer leads him to return with the Greeks, who have come for the same purpose. The two scenes in the Welsh are probably based on Chaucer, I, 64–84 (cf. p. 267 above), and 85–126 (Criseyde appeals to Hector to save her). Later the author rarely or never shows so much independence in developing Chaucer's hints.

[2] Anatole le Braz, *Le théatre celtique* (Paris, 1904), pp. 61, 64. The materials for a knowledge of the Welsh drama are doubly buried for most students, in the Welsh language and in Welsh manuscript libraries. One whose ability to use either is greatly limited must be cautious and follow those who are more fortunate.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 62, but cf. 64–5.

[4] There is a history of Tristan and Esyllt in a MS. of about 1550 at Cardiff, apparently partly in dialogue (*Rep. on Welsh MSS.*, II, i, pp. 105–6). On all this see le Braz, pp. 62–74; *Rep. on W. MSS.*, I, ii, pp. 428, 454–6, 467, 491 (all among the Peniarth MSS. in the National Library of Wales); II, i, pp. 104, 108, 145 (at Cardiff), 365 (at Wrexham), 331 (among the Havod MSS. at Cardiff), 367 (at Llanwrin), II, iii, p. 935 (date and nature not stated, among the Cwrtmawr MSS.). For plays in much later MSS. see II, i, pp. 261, 296, iii, p. 935, iv, p. 1128, and le Braz, pp. 74 ff. Except for a few Cornish plays (I, ii, p. 651, II, ii, p. 563), no others are mentioned. A Welshman (with others' help) contributed to the English Elizabethan drama, however, *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, on a congenial subject.

[5] Most of the evidence for this is mentioned in the introduction (pp. xiii f.) to the writer's edition of *Troilus and Cressida* in the *Tudor Shakespeare* (Macmillan, 1912).

through a document in the British Museum[1], the identity of which with any play otherwise known is uncertain, though it may be Dekker and Chettle's *Troilus and Cressida*, 1599[2]. Since the play was performed by the Lord Admiral's men, we may call its remains the Admiral fragment. Now it is striking that in all these plays we have, as in the Welsh play, a council-scene in which Priam consults with his sons and chief counsellors as to what to do about Helen. In Heywood[3] the scene comes before Paris abducts her, and the question debated is whether he shall do this. In the other three the question is whether Helen shall be returned at the demand of the Greeks[4]. Though the three plays vary much in their other contents, this scene seems to have struck all the dramatists as effective and necessary, doubtless because it offered an imposing means of setting forth the main situation and of differentiating some of the main characters[5]. But clearly this is not true of the Welsh play. In it the cause of the war is of minor importance, and had been set forth already, and all of the characters in this scene except Troilus are unimportant for this play. In other words, the subject of the other plays is in two parts, the story of the war and Troilus' love-story, but apart from this scene the Welsh play deals

[1] MS. Addit. 10449, fol. 5; see the *Henslowe Papers*, ed. W. W. Greg (London, 1907), pp. 142, 144, 127–9. It is an analysis by scenes, giving the names of the characters and the entrances and exits, and was to be hung up near the tiring-room to guide the call-boy in his duties. The date (ascertained by means of the actors' names mentioned) is not far from 1599. The analysis is incomplete at the beginning and middle, but must contain a good half of the play or more.

[2] *Henslowe's Diary* (ed. Greg), II, 202.

[3] Heywood's *Dramatic Works* (London, 1874), III, 265–271, act I, sc. 1; the scene comes at the same point in Caxton's *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* (ed. Sommer, pp. 517 ff.), which is Heywood's source and (almost certainly) Shakespeare's.

[4] Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, II, ii. In the Admiral fragment there can be no doubt that the first extant scene is this. The presence of Priam and Cassandra proves the scene to be in Troy; the heralds and tuckets indicate an embassy; the presence of Ulysses and Diomed suggests that the embassy came to demand the return of Helen (cf. Heywood, pp. 292–3; Caxton, pp. 556 ff.); Hector is always one of the counsellors, Deiphobus is in Caxton (pp. 522–3), and other names are missing at this point; the entrance of Cassandra at the end can only be to lament their funest decision (as in Shakespeare, II, ii, 97 ff.; Heywood, pp. 269–271; Caxton, pp. 526–7). Menelaus seems to come with the ambassadors to demand his wife, as he does later in Heywood, p. 307; two or three of the fragmentary names are hard to identify, and may be miswritten. This play is more fully discussed in a longer article, presently to appear in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, on the siege of Troy in Elizabethan literature.

[5] This scene also occurs in Heywood's *Britain's Troy* (1609), pp. 186 ff., a narrative poem largely founded on Caxton; and in the similar anonymous *Life and Death of Hector* (1614). In Peele's *Tale of Troy*, a very brief narrative summary (written a good while before 1589), we find a council-scene, Cassandra and all, after the war has begun (ll. 262–7), as in the Admiral fragment, the Welsh and Shakespeare's plays, and as it is not in Caxton and Lydgate. Here too, perhaps, we may see the influence of some play. The impressiveness of this scene on the stage may be the reason why one of the few original passages introduced into *The Life and Death of Hector*, a slavish modernizing of Lydgate's *Troy Book*, describes a council of Priam and his sons to determine the fate of the prisoner Thoas (cf. *Münchener Beiträge*, XLII, pp. 132–3).

only with the latter; this scene belongs wholly to the former, and here therefore is purely gratuitous. It was scarcely taken from Caxton's *Recuyell*. It is not conspicuous there, comes at a different point in the story, there are no unique resemblances, and elsewhere the play seems to show no connection with his work. The indications are that it was not very wisely borrowed from some of the other plays.

It is well to consider the resemblances between the Welsh play and the English plays a little more in detail. The Admiral fragment seems to show none that is not found in another. In Shakespeare's play, as in the Welsh (and probably in the fragment), we have seen that the council debates the return of Helen on the Greeks' demand, not her seizure (as in Heywood and Caxton). The most striking point is that in both Helenus is at the council, shows a timorous spirit, and is taunted in the next speech by his brother Troilus as a cowardly priest[1]. Between the Welsh play and Heywood's *Iron Age* there are other resemblances. In both, Æneas and Antenor are present at the council (as not in Caxton). Troilus' aunt Hesione and the wrong done her, as having justified the rape of Helen, are mentioned in both[2], especially in Troilus' and Priam's speeches. Finally, there is the curious figure of Sinon in the Welsh play, who appears as acolyte to Kalkas in the divination scene (p. 10), and as his treacherous servant and the false accuser of Kressyd in the trial scene (pp. 23–35). Given the need of a piece of dirty treachery, perhaps there is no character in the Troy story a more promising candidate for the office than the Sinon of the second book of the *Æneid*; yet Sinon here has more points of resemblance with the Sinon (in the second part, it is true) of *The Iron Age*. Appearing in the very first scene (pp. 356–9) as a deformed, cruel and cunning attendant of Pyrrhus, instantly recognizing Thersites as a kindred spirit, he declares himself a woman-hater, wagers with Diomed that he can seduce Cressida from Diomed's love, and wins and exposes her inside ten minutes (pp. 362–6). Curious as it is to find Sinon a Trojan, which utterly stultifies Virgil's wooden-horse story, it is still more curious to find Sinon in both plays betraying Cressida[3].

[1] Welsh, pp. 17–20; *T. and C.* II, ii, 33–50; based on Caxton, 523–4. The 'three score kings' (p. 13) suggest the 'sixty and nine, that wore Their crownets regal' of Shakespeare's Prologue; also in Caxton, p. 546.

[2] Welsh, pp. 20, 21; *I. A.* pp. 265–9. She is referred to by Troilus slightingly, but not named, in Shakespeare, II, ii, 77, 80.

[3] I may add that in the Welsh play (p. 22) in his closing speech at the council Priam says of Helen, 'Let her choose either Menelaus or Paris'; this recalls *The Iron Age*, where she really does make the choice, in a highly elaborate scene (306–9). Oenone is mentioned in both, not in the others. In the Welsh play (p. 15) and in Shakespeare (II, ii, 130 ff.) Paris reminds the other counsellors that he abducted Helen at their wish, as he actually does in Heywood and Caxton. These points are insignificant.

These specific resemblances to Shakespeare's and Heywood's plays, without emphasizing any one of them, not only tie the Welsh play more closely to the Elizabethan drama, they justify the guess that its author knew either these two plays or one much like them, perhaps a common source[1]. He can hardly have known either in its printed form. *The Iron Age* was never published until 1632, and while Shakespeare's *Troilus* was published twice in quarto in 1609, four years before the date found half-way through the Welsh manuscript, this play, which translates Chaucer with such fidelity, shows no hint of verbal resemblance to Shakespeare. It seems likely, then, that the author had seen a performance of one or two of the Elizabethan plays, and speedily set about to do likewise. One cannot but please himself by fancying this mountaineer, skilled in his native poetry, a lover of the ancient classics and a lover of Chaucer, come to London of late, captivated instantly by the greatest dramatic literature of the world, then at its height, and with somewhat artless enthusiasm rushing into imitation.

We can now roughly date the play, with some probability. We can prove in a curious way that the dates 1613 (on p. 119) and 1622 (pp. 160 and 231) are merely the dates of the manuscript, and are not copied from the original; for we can prove that this lapse of nine years came when the present manuscript had reached p. 136. From that page on, the handwriting changes slightly, and the ink is different and shows a tendency to disintegrate the paper; both changes are found in another of John Jones' MSS. (Peniarth 112, dated 1610–19), and are known to have been adopted by him a few years after 1610 (but evidently not before 1613)[2]. If the dates in the manuscript were those of composition, all the writing should be of the second type. Besides this, he was much in the habit of dating his manuscripts. The year 1613 is therefore only the *terminus ad quem*. For the other end we can get nearer than 1532, when Henryson's poem was first printed. While plays on the Trojan war and the love of Troilus are occasionally mentioned early, it is clear that their especial vogue was between 1595 and 1605. The uneducated people in Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and *V*, *Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Twelfth Night* (only; dated 1598–1602) make frequent allusions to characters in the Troilus and Troy stories, probably to be ascribed to the popularity of the plays. The date of Heywood's

[1] In my later article I shall show grounds for thinking that such may have existed. There is no reason for thinking he knew one of the extant plays rather than the other. Of course I recognize that these plays in their acting forms may not have been precisely like the printed versions.

[2] Hist. MSS. Comm., *Rep. on Welsh MSS.* I, ii, pp. 661, 671; and p. 206 above.

Iron Age is 1593–1607, probably before 1600; perhaps it is to be identified with the play 'troye,' mentioned in 1596 in Henslowe's Diary[1]. The Admiral fragment is to be dated 1597–1602; about 1599 if it is identified with Dekker and Chettle's 'Troyeles & creasse daye,' mentioned by Henslowe[2]. The date of Shakespeare's play is probably 1601–2. There is a good likelihood, therefore, that the Welsh *Troelws and Kressyd* dates from about 1595–1610[3].

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, U.S.A.

[1] Ed. by Greg, II, p. 180, etc. Mr Greg notes (II, p. 202) the striking popularity of Greek subjects about 1599.

[2] II, p. 202, etc.; cf. p. 279 above. These dates and other evidence are discussed in my article already mentioned.

[3] If we choose to see in it the direct influence of Shakespeare's and Heywood's plays, we may say about 1602–10. The work is interesting enough, perhaps, in the history of Welsh and English literature, to deserve to be fully published in the original, with a translation.

BALLAD COLLECTIONS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

The folk-ballad had to wait long in this country before coming in to its own. Professor Child's collection is the consummation of work begun two centuries earlier. His volumes represent the total achievement of all previous toilers in the same field; their scattered gleanings are absorbed in his patiently garnered harvest, a harvest which involved much sifting of wheat from tares, and the tares were false growths of many kinds. A glance through his pages is enough to show the peculiar difficulties that beset ballad editors. From the beginning they have had no easy task, but the motives and ideals which actuated their work have varied from age to age; hence the differences discernible in their methods.

It is unnecessary here to follow the ballad through the earlier stages of confusion. The course of its struggle for existence and recognition has been traced already more than once[1]. Briefly, the steps were these. First came the gradual decay of traditional ballads, when, from the changed conditions of social life, the composition of 'folk poetry' became almost an impossibility. Then followed the rise of a debased kind of balladry, not dependent on oral tradition, but offered to the public in the form of chap-book versions and broadsides. Neither popular nor literary in style, these productions were commonly regarded as one species with the folk-ballads and brought them under the same condemnation. At length, in the opening years of the eighteenth century, may be seen a tardy recognition of the claims of popular poetry, resulting in a few cautious eulogies, some rather disappointing collections, and a handful of imitations.

This was the position when Allan Ramsay took the field, and he did less for the cause of the popular ballad than has generally been supposed. The collections of James Watson (1706, 1709, 1711), of Thomas

[1] See Bibliography, II.

D'Urfey (1719) and of the anonymous editor of *A Collection of Old Ballads* (1723, 1725, 1727), though not of great intrinsic value, had all helped to break ground for succeeding explorers. But Ramsay did not venture far into the untried ballad territory; his collections served mainly to bring the ancient songs of Scotland into notice. In the Bannatyne MS., whence he gathered 'that store which fills his *Ever Green*,' there is not a single folk-ballad, and the few which he saw fit to add are of suspicious authenticity. 'The Battle of Harlaw' is quite unlike the traditional poem on the same subject. Of his version of 'Johnie Armstrang' Ramsay says that it is the 'true old ballad,' and that he has been informed that 'it was ever esteemed the genuine Ballad, the common one, false.' But Motherwell remarks that 'the common ballad alluded to by Ramsay is the one which is in the mouths of the people[1].' 'The Ballat of the Reid Square,' first published in *The Ever Green*, was altered by Ramsay from the Bannatyne MS., and 'what is altogether unpardonable,' as Scott tells us, 'the MS., which is itself rather inaccurate, has been interpolated to favour his readings[2].' The chief contributions to ballad poetry in *The Tea-Table Miscellany* are the first versions printed of 'Johnny Faa' and 'Sweet William's Ghost,' which has a few modern touches, notably in the last two stanzas; a short and very beautiful copy of 'Rare Willie drown'd in Yarrow' from the *Orpheus Caledonius*; and good, uncorrupted versions of 'Bonny Barbara Allan' and 'The Bonny Earl of Murray.'

It is hardly too much to say that the modern imitations published by Ramsay did more than the genuine ballads to awaken interest in the traditional poetry of Scotland. Two of these imitations, 'The Braes of Yarrow' and 'Hardyknute,' are the most pleasing artificial ballads that appeared before the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*. This seems inexplicable considering that the writers of the last half of the century had many more genuine models than were available in the first quarter. It may be that Percy's tinkering did more harm than has been estimated and that public taste, depraved by his polished specimens, neglected the finer pieces in his collection and demanded sentiment and elegance at all costs. It may be that Lady Wardlaw had more traditional stuff to work on than has come to light; Hamilton's poem, we know, was founded upon an ancient fragment. Whatever the reason, no imitation of the century has the spirited swing of 'Hardyknute,' or the pathos and strangeness of 'The Braes of Yarrow.'

[1] *Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern*, 1827. Introduction, p. lxii, note 3.
[2] *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, 1802. Introduction to 'The Raid of Reidswire.'

Neither piece, it is true, succeeds very well as an echo of the old style. The latter is sometimes commended as having caught the very breath of popular song[1]. But what ancient ballad of love and murder and despair, and there are many such to choose from, is told in this melancholy, fantastic strain of grief, in these echoing, dirge-like lines, which so slowly unfold the tragedy? Something of the mysterious reserve of a folk-ballad is rendered in 'The Braes of Yarrow,' but nothing of its speed and directness.

'Hardyknute,' printed by Ramsay in both his collections, has a rather complicated history and the truth concerning its authorship never seems to have been satisfactorily cleared up[2]. Whatever the exact facts may be, and there is little reason to doubt that Lady Wardlaw was responsible for the fragment as it first appeared, this is a surprisingly good poem, considering the date of its composition. The language is picturesque and seldom over-strained, the story, so far as it goes—not too far, fortunately—is interesting and the metre well managed. But there is too much padding and too little energy. Compared with ancient battle pieces the style lacks virility, and the tale moves forward too leisurely.

Many failures, less creditable than these two early attempts, show how difficult a task it is to imitate the manner of the traditional ballad.

[1] Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, vol. v, p. 410; vol. vi, p. 111 (note).

[2] 'Hardyknute' was first published by James Watson in Edinburgh, 1719. It was printed by Ramsay in *The Ever Green*, 1724, with two additional stanzas and some minor alterations. In the first edition of the *Reliques* Percy gave an account of the authorship of the poem, supplied by Lord Hailes, who stated that Lady Wardlaw had acknowledged it to be her own composition and as proof had produced three more stanzas (*Reliques*, ed. 1765, II, pp. 87–88). Lady Wardlaw died in 1727. A new edition of the poem was prepared for the press by John Clerk, M.D. of Edinburgh. This included twelve new stanzas. Pinkerton, in his *Scottish Tragic Ballads*, 1781, published a continuation of the poem and, with it, another account of the authorship, also supplied by Lord Hailes. This nobleman sent to Pinkerton a letter, supposed to have been written by Sir John Bruce of Kinross to Lord Binning about the year 1719. Sir John states that he is sending a 'true copy' of the poem, which he had found in a vault at Dunfermline, 'written on vellum in a fair Gothic character.' This letter is clearly a forgery: the passion for vaults and Gothic characters had not yet arisen in 1719, but it is not easy to decide whether Pinkerton or Lord Hailes was responsible for it. The former seems the more likely culprit; he would be anxious to establish the authenticity of the piece so that his own forgery might pass undetected. But Lord Hailes was still alive in 1781, and the double forgery would seem too daring even for Pinkerton. Percy believed in the story and remarked in the 1794 edition of the *Reliques* that the letter 'plainly proves the pretended discoverer of the fragment to have been Sir John Bruce himself.' Ritson did not attempt to decide between the rival claimants; it was enough for him that 'the *bantling* is certainly *spurious*' (*Gentleman's Magazine*, November, 1784). In the introduction to 'Sir James the Ross' in Anderson's Poets (p. 290), the editor says of this poem of Bruce that 'it challenges a place with the 'Hardyknute' of his countryman, Sir John Bruce of Kinross.' Scott took it for granted that Pinkerton invented the story of Bruce and ignored Lord Hailes' part in the affair. (*Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, ed. Henderson, Introductory Remarks on Popular Poetry, p. 44.) Since Scott's time Lady Wardlaw seems to have been left in possession.

It seems easy. Andrew Lang gives the following 'Recipe to forge a Border Ballad[1]'—'Take the *Border Papers*, edited by Joseph Bain (1890). Select a good, rousing incident, say the slaying of Ridley at the Newcastle football match (May, 1599). Write it with as many rhymes in "e" as possible. Avoid profusion of obsolete words. Carefully abstain from dropping into poetry. Add a few anachronisms and distort historical facts to taste; employ the regular ballad formulae sparingly and with caution, strain off, dish, and serve up with historical notes, adding to taste fables about your source, à la Surtees. Remember that nothing can be less like an old ballad than the ballads of Mr D. G. Rossetti.' This is a flippant way of approaching the subject; moreover the instructions are inadequate. A cook might as well have all the ingredients of a cake ready to hand, without the fire to bake it. It is because modern balladists have relied too much on the externals of metre and style that they have failed. How is the old vividness to be revived; the old, fierce cry of eager hearts, storm-swept by the elemental passions of mankind; the child-like, unquestioning outlook on life which, once gone, is gone for ever? A modern poet may perhaps be fairly successful in describing some such 'rousing incident' as Mr Lang suggests, for in this an impersonal attitude is more easily maintained. But let him try his hand on some theme, not of combat, but of human emotion, and he will find it impossible to combine the stark simplicity of the popular ballads with their force and intensity. The old world has passed away and with it the wild, semi-barbarous conditions of life which made the composition of folk-ballads possible. In the most carefully faked counterfeits the deliberate literary intention is evident; the first fine careless rapture cannot be recaptured. Percy failed in his attempts, so did Pinkerton and Chatterton and Hogg and Surtees and many others. And at last even Scott failed, and what Scott failed to do with his magic sympathy and his delicate, supple handling of forgotten legends, no other poet need hope to accomplish.

The other modern compositions included in *The Tea-Table Miscellany* do not need lengthy consideration. 'William and Margaret,' claimed by Mallet, turns out to be a genuine old ballad, revised and spoilt for the printing press[2]. 'Lucy and Colin,' by Thomas Tickell, and 'Henry and Katharine' both belong to the type of imitation that is frankly modern in style and diction and makes no attempt to catch the ancient manner.

[1] J. A. Farrer, *Literary Forgeries*, 1907. Introduction by Lang, p. xxv.
[2] Phelps, *The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement*, Appendix.

Many scores of such poems were turned out later in the century, and may best be studied in the pages of Evans's collection. Scott draws a distinction between these 'legendary tales,' as they came to be called, and the deliberately wrought pastiches of the old style, such as were attempted by Pinkerton, Hogg and Jamieson[1]. Scott himself essayed both types.

Popular as Ramsay's books were it seems strange that no further attempt at ballad editing should have been made for nearly half a century. Probably the learned men of the time thought such a task beneath them, while the few whose spirits might have been stirred by the rousing echoes of early song had not material enough to work upon. Herein lies the supreme importance of the *Reliques*. For future generations a starting point was given, a priceless foundation of genuine traditional verse upon which to build up other collections. Herd, Pinkerton and Evans, as well as Ritson, who was malignantly anxious to show the world how ancient poetry ought to be edited, all owed to Percy the impulse which set them collecting. And the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, with its far-reaching influence, was directly inspired by the *Reliques*.

Percy's editorial methods are well known, but, before condemning them too harshly, it should be remembered that he was aiming at something quite different from the modern ideal of faithful reproduction. His object was to publish a book which should appeal to the general reader of his day. He himself had been unexpectedly interested in the torn pages of his folio manuscript and it occurred to him that some of the pieces were worth printing[2]. At the same time he realised that it would be useless to offer them to the public in their rough and fragmentary condition. So he set to work to repair them. Possibly the pleasure and amusement afforded by this occupation led Percy further than he intended, for it cannot be denied that his handling of many of the old pieces is little less than profane.

Only one poem, 'The Boy and the Mantle,' is given verbatim from his manuscript, and 'a more modern copy of this ballad' is appended for such readers 'as have no relish for pure antiquity.' Several poems

[1] *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, ed. Henderson, Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad, vol. iv, pp. 13, 14.

[2] Forty-five of the 175 pieces printed in the *Reliques* were extracted from the folio MS., which itself contains 150 poems. (Bishop Percy's Folio MS., ed. Hales and Furnivall, vol. i, Forewords, p. xxii.) The other chief sources drawn upon were the printed broad sheets, Scottish ballads sent by Lord Hailes, and various collections, printed and manuscript. In addition to the 'reliques' were included 'little elegant pieces of the lyric kind,' a concession to the polite readers of the day.

have not one stanza exactly as in the original, others are twisted into quite new settings, while the vivacity of nearly all is weakened by unnecessary emendations.

There is a curious conflict of taste visible, not only in the many notes and illustrations scattered through the book, but also in the very various handling meted out to the ballads. As a rule the eighteenth century craze for elegance and smoothness swept away all scruples and Percy pruned with a heavy hand. Occasionally, however, his conscience asserted itself and forbade any interference. The matchlessly beautiful 'Child Waters' is hardly touched, and one notes this with especial gratitude, remembering the way in which later editors treated this ballad, remembering also that Percy could seldom resist a sentimental opening, which is clearly offered here. There are about half a dozen other poems from the manuscript with only slight verbal alterations—rhymes corrected, constructions made clearer, metrical roughnesses smoothed away. Less excusable emendations are in the cause of refinement or ingenuity. The 'salt water' within fair Bessye's eyes is crystallised into 'pearlie dropps'; the three messengers of the queen, slandered by Sir Aldingar, become a 'faire damselle'; old Robin of Portingale hides twenty knights within his chamber, and so the irony of the original situation is lost.

Emendations and corrections, however extensive, do not cover the whole extent of Percy's handiwork. Some of the ballads he made over again into quite new poems; 'Valentine and Ursine' is entirely his own composition; there is only one verse in 'The Child of Elle' given exactly from the MS.; the latter half of 'Sir Cauline' is invention, and the conclusion of 'The Heir of Linne' a clever piece of forgery. The different quality of editorial workmanship in these three poems is remarkable. There is hardly a false note in the last named. Though only a few lines of the original are given verbatim, there is no impression of unreality in the diction; the ballad manner is copied carefully and with excellent effect. On a much lower plane are the modern parts of 'Sir Cauline' and 'The Child of Elle': it was generally the primrose path of romance that led Percy astray. The style of the former throughout is hopelessly artificial. The inappropriately tragic conclusion illustrates the eighteenth century inability to realise how a ballad should end, a weakness apparent also in 'The Child of Elle,' where a happy finish is tacked on to an obviously tragic story. This is an even more depressing example of Percy's worst manner than 'Sir Cauline,' though Scott says that the emendations are 'in the truest

style of Gothic embellishment[1].' This may be taken as a fair sample of the embellishing process.

The strong and moving lines:

> he leaned ore his saddle bow
> to kisse this Lady good;
> the teares that went them 2 betweene
> were blend water and blood.

are replaced by the following stanza:

> And thrice he claspde her to his breste,
> And kiste her tenderlie:
> The teares that fell from her fair eyes,
> Ranne like the fountayne free.

Of course it was much that Percy should himself have seen the beauty of the fragment and it was clearly impossible for him to have printed it without a certain amount of manipulation. In 1765 public taste was divided against itself; it demanded two things not easily reconcilable, romantic wildness and a smooth, elegant style. The old ballads provided situations picturesque and thrilling enough to gratify the most exacting palate. But their style was rough and unpolished, entirely without ornament and the conventional graces of poetic diction. Percy understood the taste of his time and, only half realising that it was a perverted and jaded taste, he set himself to make his 'parcel of old ballads' as attractive as might be. Scott puts the matter with his usual fairness when defending Percy from the violent attacks of Ritson[2]. 'It is, no doubt, highly desirable that the text of ancient poetry should be given untouched and uncorrupted. But this is a point which did not occur to the editor of the *Reliques* in 1765, whose object it was to win the favour of the public, at a period when the great difficulty was not how to secure the very words of the old ballads, but how to arrest attention upon the subject at all.' This needs emphasis: had Percy printed his manuscript with absolute faithfulness its influence would have been delayed quite half a century, if indeed it had not been discounted completely at the outset[3].

It is surprising that the first collection directly inspired by the *Reliques* should contain some of the most trustworthy work of the

[1] *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, Introduction to 'Erlinton.'

[2] *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, ed. Henderson, Introductory Remarks on Popular Poetry, vol. I. p. 38.

[3] The folio MS. itself is of course priceless. But of all the ballads in the *Reliques* only five are accepted by Child as Percy prints them, and these five perforce, because the originals are lost. 'Edward,' 'Sir Patrick Spens,' 'The Jew's Daughter' and 'Lord Thomas and Fair Annet' were contributed by Lord Hailes. 'King Estmere' was torn from the folio by Percy, sent to the press and never recovered.

century. David Herd's *Ancient and Modern Scottish Songs* was published anonymously in 1769. A second edition in two volumes came out in 1776. This would have appeared earlier, but the MSS. had been lent to Percy, who promised not only to furnish 'a good number of old Scots songs and poems' transcribed from the Maitland MS., but also to fill up some of the imperfect pieces 'in the manner that old broken fragments of antique statues have been repaired and compleated by modern masters[1]' (letter to Paton, August 22, 1774). It all came to nothing. After nearly a year Percy returned the papers, with no poems from the Maitland MS. and, fortunately, no emendations from his own facile pen. He had been appreciative of the value of the first edition, and wrote in praise of it to Paton, not knowing then who was the editor (Feb. 9, 1769)[2]. In the same letter he suggested that notes would have been useful, giving the sources, history, locality and authorship of the poems whenever possible. Both in the Preface and Advertisement to the 1769 edition Herd promised notes, to be inserted in the second volume, which he intended to appear as an additional series of poems, though it finally entailed an entire re-arrangement of the collection. However, when the second edition appeared, there were no notes, and the Glossary, also promised, was hastily compiled by Wotherspoon[3]. This is typical of Herd's casual methods: to use Dr Hecht's words, 'it shows how little interest Herd himself took in the publication of the volumes. He collected carefully and transcribed carefully but could not be bothered with editorial cares.' He laboured for his own delight and disregarded equally public praise and censure. His volumes are a mixture of good and bad, genuine old fragments and modern trash, thrown together without distinction and with no account of authorship or sources. It was too early to leave the general reader to discriminate for himself and the value of Herd's zeal as a collector is impaired by his negligence as an editor.

A later generation can better appreciate the importance of Herd's work. Whether borrowed from some earlier printed collection or copied from his manuscripts, the poems in his book are nearly always given with perfect fidelity. Occasionally slight alterations are made, but these are of trifling importance and it is significant that they occur far more frequently in the poems taken from printed than from manuscript sources. From Ramsay and Percy he borrows a good deal. 'Edom o' Gordon,' with the orthography slightly changed, 'Young Waters,'

[1] *Songs from David Herd's Manuscripts*, ed. Hans Hecht, 1904. Introduction, pp. 20–22.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

'Edward,' 'Waly, Waly,' and 'Gil Morice,' with its ugly modern excrescences, all come from the *Reliques*. In his choice between the two versions given by Percy of 'Bonny Barbara Allan' and 'Lord Thomas and Fair Annet,' Herd shows his fine taste, selecting the more dramatic piece in each case. 'Sir Patrick Spens' he also gives from the *Reliques*, though he had another unpublished copy among his MSS., a longer and less poetically perfect version. What other ballad editor would have had the same self-restraint? From Ramsay he borrows 'Johnie Armstrang' (this also with the spelling changed), 'The Bonny Earl of Murray,' 'The Battle of Harlaw,' 'Sweet William's Ghost,' and 'The Battle of Reid-Squair.' He also gives 'Lady Anne Bothwell's Lament' in its most lengthy form from *The Tea-Table Miscellany*; Percy wisely printed only seven verses; Pinkerton, more wisely still, only four.

Among the ballads first printed by Herd are 'The Braes of Yarrow,' 'Fine Flowers of the Valley,' 'Bothwell,' 'Lizie Wan,' 'May Colvin' and 'The Wee Wee Man.' In the interesting group of 'Fragments of Heroic Ballads' are also found for the first time in any printed collection: 'Lammikin' (there was an older version among the Percy papers but it was not published), 'The Bonny Lass of Lochroyan,' 'Clerk Colvill,' 'Kertonha,' 'Earl Douglas than quham nevir knicht' ('Jamie Douglas'), 'She has call'd to her bower maidens' ('Young Hunting' or 'Earl Richard'), 'Who will bake' ('Fair Annie') and 'The Cruel Knight.' The 'Fragments of Comic and Humourous Songs' include 'The Bonny Lass of Anglesey' and, very strangely, a few verses from the tragic piece known as 'The Cruel Mother'—'And she's lean'd her back to a thorn.'

This long list of traditional ballads first published by Herd is sufficient proof of the value of his work. In however fragmentary a state the poems may be, they are all precious and are transcribed by the editor from his manuscripts with scrupulous accuracy. Together with other good versions of ballads printed earlier, they all find a place in Child's collection, where the printed copies are named with the MS. versions as being equally reliable. Had the volumes been edited more carefully they would have proved a useful antidote to the *Reliques*. The evil effect of Percy's upholstering was already evident, and Herd's promiscuous arrangement of ancient and modern compositions doubtless helped to strengthen that false conception of folk-poetry which gave rise to the prolific growth of the 'legendary tale,' now beginning to flourish apace.

Of these imitations included by Herd, the most important—'Hardyknute' and 'The Braes of Yarrow'—had been several times published. 'Duncan' and 'Kenneth' are the work of Henry Mackenzie, as Scott informs us[1], and in both poems the man of feeling is more apparent than the man of action. In each, just as the story reaches the climax and we expect the clash of arms, there is a significant hiatus and the narrative returns with relief, in the one case to the 'weeping Mary' and in the other to 'fair Margaret with her maidens.'

'The modern and extremely vapid ballad of Frennet Hall,' as Child characterises it, is an anonymous poem on the mysterious fire of Frendraught. It deserves harsh criticism so far as the diction is concerned, but the conclusion is unusually restrained. The whole catastrophe is implied in the last verse:

> The lady slee with honeyed words
> Entic'd thir youths to stay:
> But morning sun ne'er shone upon
> Lord John nor Rothemay.

Certainly, this is not exactly what we should find in a traditional ballad, but it is better than the protracted scenes of anguish or the ill-timed moralisings with which most imitations end. Modern writers have failed nearly always in the conclusions of their ballads. To begin in the old, reckless manner, plunging straight 'in medias res,' is a difficult task. But it is infinitely harder to end in the rapid, unexpected way of popular song—to pull up short without any comments on the story or any reflections on life and its vicissitudes. Almost invariably a modern poet betrays himself by some conventional mannerism, by a desire to moralise his song, by a mistaken notion of emphasis or by some irrepressible note of egotism breaking through the reserve that should hide a singer of ballads.

The Reprint of 1791 includes most of Pinkerton's forgeries, also the version of 'The Child of Elle,' published in the *Reliques*: the substitution of these pieces for much genuine stuff seems to show that this issue did not receive Herd's personal supervision. The only poem in the first edition, omitted from the second, is 'The Heir of Linne,' Percy's most successful piece of patchwork.

One looks in vain for any hopeful signs of integrity in John Pinkerton's collection, first published in 1781 as *Scottish Tragic Ballads*. A second edition in two volumes came out in 1783, under

[1] *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, ed. Henderson, Introductory Remarks, vol. I, p. 43.

a slightly different title—*Select Scotish Ballads.* Translations of four Spanish romances were added in the second edition[1]; also the following ballads: 'Gilderoy,' 'The Child of Elle,' 'The Gypsies came,' 'The Cruel Knight,' and 'Young Waters.' Pinkerton gave no account of his authorities, borrowed from Percy, Herd and Ramsay without acknowledgment; and, to the intense wrath of Ritson, who exposed him in *The Gentleman's Magazine*[2], he palmed off several inventions of his own as traditional ballads.

Considering the style of these forgeries it is surprising that Pinkerton did not alter the genuine ballads more extensively. 'Child Maurice,' 'Edom o' Gordon' and 'The Child of Elle' are given almost verbatim from Percy or Herd. From 'Young Waters,' from 'Lady Bothwell's Lament' and probably from 'Sir James the Rose,' verses are judiciously dropped, the last being handled freely but with discretion. 'The Earl of Murray' and 'The Gypsy Laddie' are close to Ramsay's versions. The most unforgivable corrections are those in 'Edward,' which, as given by Percy, is perfect and unapproachable, though the archaic spelling was better simplified. 'The Earl of Murray' is similarly tampered with, though here the spelling is Scotticised and that with better effect than usual. Already it is clear that different motives are beginning to animate the collectors. Percy altered for greater elegance and ingenuity; he hoped to make silk purses out of sow's ears, but, mistaking his material, too often he reversed the process. Pinkerton's emendations were for the sake of consistency and common sense. He liked a Scottish ballad to live up to its name and changed the 'gates of London' into the 'hichts of Lundie,' 'Highlands' into 'Hielands' and so on. He lends a few corrections to 'Sir Patrick Spens,' where 'palpable absurdity seemed to require them,' and the things which struck him as palpably absurd were cork-heild shoon; hats, wet in the sea; ladies with fans in their hands and gold kems in their hair. Again, in 'Sir James the Rose,' he supplies a motive for the woman's perfidy, so following the common practice of eighteenth century editors, who could not digest the causeless acts of treachery and violence so often related in ballad poetry and felt constrained to make events seem at least possible.

[1] These four romances were translated by Pinkerton from the *Historia de las Guerras Civiles de Granada.* Percy had already published two translations from the same source in the *Reliques* (Series I, Book II, Nos. 16 and 17). In Evans's *Old Ballads* is found another and much worse rendering by Carter of the third romance attempted by Pinkerton. (Vol. III, No. 18.)

[2] November, 1784.

'Binnorie' shows Pinkerton at work in a different way. Usually he kept fairly close to his originals or else invented entirely new poems. 'Binnorie' he acknowledged to be 'one half from tradition and one half by the editor,' though, as Child says, 'one fourth and three fourths would have been a more exact apportionment.' There are only about seven verses that correspond with traditional versions; the conclusion which recounts the elder sister's suicide and the squire's sententious remarks upon the occurrence are Pinkerton's invention, and the whole beautiful story is spoilt in the telling. Such lines as:

> Up raise he sune in frichtfu' mude;
> Busk ye, 'my meiny,' and seek the flude,

and the last stanza:

> But I'll main for the my Isabel deir
> Full mony a dreiry day, bot weir

stamp the thing at once as Pinkerton's. His phraseology cannot easily be mistaken after a single perusal of the second part of 'Hardyknute.'

This is his most elaborate imposture, and so far as externals go, it was well carried out. The notes are written guilelessly and in seeming good faith. The passages chosen for special commendation are, it is true, from the original fragment, but, in the extravagant praise bestowed upon the poem as a whole, naturally no distinctions are drawn. To make the two parts hang together Pinkerton changed the second half of verse eighteen and inserted another stanza, with the remark that it 'was surprising its omission was not marked in the fragment formerly published.' As a poetical achievement the continuation is far below the original. The story is incoherent and leads on to an impossible conclusion, and the language is pitched in a theatrical key that merits Ritson's scorn. 'Neither the lady, nor the common people of Lanarkshire, from whom you pretend to have recovered most of the stanzas, will deprive you of the honour of its procreation. The poetry is too artificial, too contemptible, the forgery too evident[1].'

Pinkerton's other forgeries are on a par with this. 'The Laird of Woodhouselie' seems to have been founded on the grim story of the murder of the Lord of Wariston. Genuine ballads on this subject were later printed by Jamieson and Kinloch, and it is probable that Pinkerton was familiar with some traditional scraps and on them embroidered his own handiwork. Many of the lines seem genuine

[1] *Gentleman's Magazine*, November, 1784.

but the treatment is laboured and the metre gives a very different effect from the usual ballad swing:

Shyning was the painted ha
Wi gladsum torches bricht:
Full twenty gowden dames sat there
And ilk ane by a knicht:
Wi music cheir,
To pleise the eir.
Whan beautie pleased the sicht.

'Lord Livingston,' containing the reconciliation between the two knights, is worse than this; the sentimental note is more pronounced. Again, in 'The Death of Menteith' and 'Lord Airth's Complaint' we find the same conventional ideas expressed in the same spuriously archaic Scots, with the constant recurrence of favourite phrases and words. One cannot escape the conviction, when reading this sophisticated language, that the author was well pleased with it. The poem beginning 'I wish I were where Helen lies' is one of the many imitations inspired by the haunting elegy, of which this is the first line.

There was no gainsaying Ritson's charge, and in the List of Scottish Poets, prefixed to a *Selection of Poems from the Maitland MS.* (vol. I, 1786), Pinkerton acknowledged his forgeries. He was a learned man, but so devoid of both taste and integrity that his collection is the most worthless of the century.

Thomas Evans's *Old Ballads*, published in two volumes in 1777, and in four volumes in 1784, is more interesting than many collections of greater intrinsic value. One wonders much what the editor was aiming at, his one apparent object being to exclude everything that Percy published, and to include everything he did not. Herd frankly calls his collection *Ancient and Modern Scots Songs*; Evans gives his the misleading label of *Old Ballads*, though to this is added on the title page: 'Historical and Narrative, with some of modern date and several originals, none of which are inserted in Dr Percy's collection.' His Preface adopts the usual apologetic tone towards eighteenth century readers. 'A polished age will make allowances for the rude productions of their ancestors.' After all, this cringing humility on the part of the editors was unnecessary. The general mass of the people needed no propitiation, they were ready to accept any 'parcel of old ballads' on its own merits; while the austere scholars who, like Dr Johnson, could not tolerate ballad poetry, would be proof against the deprecatory appeals of Percy, Herd, Pinkerton, Evans and Ritson.

The contents of the first of Evans's volumes and part of the second are arranged in chronological order, the poems covering the ground of English history from King Arthur to George III. The most valuable part of the first volume consists in the twenty-seven Robin Hood ballads, all of which, with one exception—'Robin Hood, Wil Scarlet and Little John'—were later printed by Ritson and in exactly the same order. The majority of these ballads are immeasurably below the 'Little Geste,' and barely deserve the name of popular poetry, but they form the one contribution of any worth in the whole of this collection. The sources are not given, but, so far as they have been traced by Professor Child, it seems that Evans copied the poems carefully and abstained from emendations. Indeed, he was even more precise than Ritson, who named his originals and so laid himself open to ready detection. The first volume also contains a number of poems found by the editor in *The Garland of Delight*, but first published in Deloney's *Strange Histories.*

The second volume contains the only two genuine folk-poems, except those already mentioned, in this collection of Old Ballads. One of these, 'Johnny Armstrang's Last Goodnight,' is the same version as appeared in *A Collection of Old Ballads*, 1723. The other, 'Child Waters,' is given also by Percy, so one may suppose that it was included by Evans for the sake of comparison with the paraphrase that follows, an instructive example of the eighteenth century ideal of refined simplicity. One quotation will suffice. In the original Burd Ellen says:

> And I had rather have a twinkling
> Child Waters of your eye,
> Than I would have Cheshire and Lancashire both,
> To take them mine own to be.

Mrs Pye's version reads thus, and it is significant that she borrows the first line straight from Pope's 'Eloïsa':

> One glance of those deluding eyes
> More rapture can bestow
> Than should our monarch quit his throne
> And that to me forego.

The semi-historical ballads come to an end half way through the second volume, which is filled out with modern imitations. The third volume opens inauspiciously with two lengthy productions, Percy's 'Hermit of Warkworth' and Blacklock's 'The Graham,' but there is a certain interest attaching to this volume in the testimony it bears to the

newly awakened enthusiasm for foreign literature. There are several poems from the French, two of Gray's translations from the Welsh, and a very bad version, taken from Carter's *Journey from Gibraltar to Malaga*, of one of the Spanish romances previously attempted by Pinkerton. In the fourth volume there is also a translation by Sir W. Jones from the Persian of Hafiz. Both the third and fourth volumes contain a number of seventeenth century ballads printed from stall copies and garlands, some very interesting Elizabethan poems, and a whole host of imitations.

Of all the collections of the century this of Evans contains the largest number of artificial ballads, and the characteristics of this tedious species may best be considered in connection with his work. With two exceptions, both forgeries, not one of these poems makes any serious attempt to reproduce the old style; or, if it does, the attempt fails ludicrously. Most are vaguely historical, as stray references to battles and kings serve to indicate, but the atmosphere of the past is never revived. The all-pervading moral tone is entirely opposed to the spirit of popular poetry, in which the narrator effaced himself, offering no personal reflections, intent only on getting his story told. The anticipated joys of a future world, the stress laid on the obligations of filial piety, and the unconvincing praises of rusticity, are all out of harmony with the frankly pagan conception of life found in the old ballads. In this vanished world death brought pain and separation, but no gladness of reunion; children most often mated against their parents' wishes and would turn with a curse on their lips against either father or mother who had crossed their hopes; and the men and women lived the simple life without knowing it, so that they saw no delights in poverty, no beauty in asceticism. Even the supernaturalism, so consciously revelled in by many of the eighteenth century balladists, is very different from that abiding fear and fascination of the unknown which inspired such poems as 'Tam Lin,' 'True Thomas,' or 'The Wife of Usher's Well.'

But the worst feature of these legendary tales is the characteristically feeble use made of the ballad metre. The old ruggedness is planed away—the old irregularity that added so much to the blithe vigour of popular ballads and saved them from monotony. An intolerable sing-song is the result. The favourite mark of punctuation is the dash. The pitch generally rises towards the end of the poems and the death of the heroine—for the heroine almost invariably dies, and the hero too, if he is faithful and virtuous—is described in short, jerky clauses,

presumably meant to convey the stress and hurry of emotion. Such verses as the following are common:

> She knew—she sunk—the night-bird screamed;
> —The moon withdrew her troubled light,
> And left the fair—though fall'n she seemed—
> To worse than death—and endless night[1].

This is another example, open to criticism on more grounds than one:

> 'And art thou him?'—exclaimed the mayde,
> 'And dost thou live?'—she cry'd:
> 'Too cruel love!'—she faintly sayd—
> Then wrung his hand—and dy'd—[2]

We may compare this hysterical movement with the nervous, onward rush of ancient verse:

> Late at e'en, drinking the wine,
> And ere they paid the lawing,
> They set a combat them between,
> To fight in the dawing[3],

or with the swift-flowing rhythm of *The Ancient Mariner*, which is the supreme triumph of modern ballad poetry:

> The ship was cheered, the harbour cleared,
> Merrily did we drop,
> Below the kirk, below the hill,
> Below the lighthouse top.

There is no need to give further examples illustrating the various peculiarities of the artificial ballad; almost any single poem would serve to display them all. 'Edwin and Ethelinde,' 'Edwin and Emma,' by Mallet, 'Edwin and Eltruda' (Edwin was a favourite name, we have also the famous 'Edwin and Angelina'), 'Matilda,' 'William and Fanny'—their titles betray them. In them all there is the same sentimentality, the straining after effect, the superficial morality, and the false, colourless diction.

The *Reliques* form the connecting link between the legendary tales and the genuine old ballads. Percy cannot be held entirely responsible for the former. Polished and refined as his specimens undoubtedly were, they yet retained virility enough to have inspired something better than these effusions. Had their authors possessed traditional versions of every folk-ballad, then or since published, it is not likely that they would have written anything very closely resembling 'Clerk

[1] 'The Field of Battle.' Penrose, *Old Ballads*, vol. III, no. 2.
[2] 'The Brydal Bed.' *Old Ballads*, vol. IV, no. 14.
[3] 'The Braes of Yarrow.' *Popular Ballads*, ed. Child, 214 (E).

Saunders' or 'Sir Patrick Spens.' Nevertheless, it was the style of the more extensively 'improved' ballads in the *Reliques*, which served as a model for the majority of imitations published after 1765, and which was to blame for their artificial diction, if not for their weakness in narrative power.

Neither of the two deliberate attempts to copy the old style deserves more than passing mention, though both forgeries were accepted by Evans as genuine. Chatterton's *Bristowe Tragedy; or the Dethe of Sir Charles Bawdin* shows the influence of the *Reliques* only too clearly. It is written in the manner of the stall copies, overlaid with a coating of Percy's false refinement. 'The Laidley Worm of Spindleston Heughs' is printed by Evans as a 'ballad, five hundred years old, made by the mountain bard, Duncan Frasier, living in Cheviot, A.D. 1270.' This minute account of the authorship of what purports to be an ancient ballad is enough to betray the hand of the impostor. The poem was sent by the Rev. Mr Lambe, of Norham, to Mr Hutchinson, who inserted it as genuine in his *History of Northumberland*. The author must have heard some traditional lines, for the story has traces of several genuine ballads which were printed later ('Kempion,' 'Allison Gross,' 'The Laily Worm and the Mackrel of the Sea'). The modern workmanship is, however, unmistakable, especially in the conclusion, which is contrary to the unwritten law forbidding a ballad singer to speak in the first person.

This collection of Evans is worthless from the point of view of the antiquarian, but it is an interesting storehouse of miscellaneous poetry, and not without value as an indication of the taste and judgment of the time[1].

Very different is the work of Joseph Ritson, the last of the eighteenth century editors. His 'atrabilious, furious and obstreperous abhorrence of every kind of forgery[2]' made him a much hated man among his contemporaries, but his editorial methods, if not his temper in debate, are above reproach. His *Select Collection of English Songs* (1783), *Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry* (1791), *Ancient Songs* (dated 1790, published 1792), *Scottish Songs* (1794), and *Robin Hood* (1795), are among the few works of the century which unite enthusiasm with scholarly methods of editing.

[1] In 1810, R. H. Evans, the son of Thomas, issued another four-volume edition of *Old Ballads*, of great interest as showing the advance made during the past quarter century. This edition is 'considerably enlarged from public and private collections'; many of the modern pieces are omitted, and the older poems carefully revised.

[2] Jamieson, *Popular Ballads*. Advertisement, p. xv.

There are comparatively few popular pieces in *The Select Collection of English Songs*, and they serve mainly to show how far superior Scottish ballad poetry is to English. The volume entitled *Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry* contains only one ballad, 'The King and the Barker,' and the editor of the second edition states that Ritson had intended to suppress it. The text is very corrupt and the ballad metre seldom recognisable. *Ancient Songs and Ballads* is perhaps the most interesting of Ritson's publications. It is arranged chronologically in five classes and contains some fragrant old English lyrics, some battle songs, and a number of carols and later love songs. But the book, as first published, was not rich in ballads; in the second edition a number from the *Select Collection of English Songs* were incorporated with the poems in Class IV. 'The Ungrateful Knight and the Flower of Northumberland' is put down to the account of Thomas Deloney, but, though first published by that writer in his *Jack of Newberie*, this poem undoubtedly belongs to the folk. Class IV also contains 'The Heir of Linne,' with a prefatory note to the effect that Percy had restored several ancient readings from his folio MS. in the 1794 edition of the *Reliques* and that 'if one could obtain a sight of that tattered fragment, it is highly probable that some modern interpolations still remain.' Had Ritson realised how large was the proportion of editorial workmanship in this poem he would hardly have printed it; it is a distinct tribute to Percy's powers that he did so.

Another testimony to the patience and zeal of Ritson is his *Robin Hood*. These two volumes contain thirty-three ballads, and Child was able to add only five more in his collection. One of these five, 'The Bold Pedlar and Robin Hood[1],' was known by Ritson to be in existence, and he twice asked Scott for it, apparently with no result[2]. Another, 'Robin Hood and the Monk,' was added in the Appendix of the 1832 edition, the editor stating that Mr Ritson 'had anxiously preserved' a small fragment of the poem. The other three pieces are not of importance. They are 'Robin Hood and the Pedlars' (printed from a MS. in a nineteenth century hand, containing some ballads supposed to be forgeries, of which this may be one), a feeble production called 'Robin Hood and the Scotchman,' and the piece already mentioned, 'Robin Hood, Will Scarlet and Little John' (otherwise 'Robin Hood

[1] 'The Bold Pedlar and Robin Hood,' and we may presume this is the ballad that Ritson was seeking, is given by Child as a traditional version of 'Robin Hood Newly Revived,' which Ritson has under the title, 'Robin Hood and the Stranger.'

[2] *The Letters of Joseph Ritson, Esq.*, 2 vols. 1833. 1. Letter to Scott, April 10, 1802 (p. 220). 2. Letter to Scott, July 2, 1803 (p. 241).

and the Prince of Arragon'), probably excluded by Ritson because he thought it spurious.

Ritson aimed solely at accuracy. 'Truth—simple majestic Truth—was the goddess whom he worshipped[1],' as Sir H. Nicolas elegantly expressed it in his Memoir. In consequence, his publications failed to please the public ear. That sensitive organ was not yet attuned to the wild music of popular poetry and inclined rather to the softened strains piped by the less scrupulous editors of the century. They, and the majority of nineteenth century collectors, made a bid for popularity and won it. It is easy to judge their work too harshly. They had to face a position whose difficulties they hardly realised themselves. Folk-poetry, as soon as ever it is written down, ceases to be folk-poetry in the strictest sense. Written words never have precisely the same effect as words chanted or sung; they become a different, to some extent a new thing. However dimly the editors may have realised this, at least it was clear to them that some manipulation was necessary before the majority of popular ballads could find acceptance with the public. In their newly acquired, uncongenial form of print, gaps and inconsistencies were apparent which would have passed unnoticed in recitation, which indeed, might not have existed in earlier stages of oral transmission. It was a difficult question for the editors to decide how far they were justified in removing these defects. Ritson was right in denouncing the depravity of those editors who mingled so much of their own handiwork with the ancient texts that the two styles of writing were confused and the public wholly deluded. On the other hand, the general reader of the eighteenth century preferred well rounded poems to incomplete fragments, however carefully transcribed. In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for August, 1793, 'Nugator,' referring to the *Reliques*, ventures to predict that it 'will remain a standard book, while the *more strictly accurate* compilations of a *peevish* antiquary or two are forgotten.' Nugator was right; Percy's diluted specimens remained first favourites with the people until ousted by Scott's, and it must be remembered that the texts of the old poems were treated with as much freedom in the *Border Minstrelsy* as in the *Reliques*, though with infinitely finer taste.

A list of ballad collections from Ramsay's to Child's would serve as a fruitful text for a sermon on the growth of the literary conscience. The eighteenth century closed hopefully with the scientific methods of Ritson, but the good effects which his example might have produced

[1] *Letters of Joseph Ritson.* Memoir, p. xix.

were swept away by the success of Scott's brilliant but unfaithful workmanship. Most of the collections inspired by *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* were edited on the same somewhat lax principles. Not until the publication of Child's great collection were the rights of the popular ballad fully established. Then, for the first time, the anonymous old poems were treated with the same respect as is paid to the writings of known authors. Every extant version of each ballad is given and, wherever possible, modern growths are ruthlessly lopped away. But in cases where the originals are lost, as happened with some of the pieces published by Percy and Buchan, ballads are necessarily given entire though the hand of the interpolator is evident.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

(i) *Collections.*

ALLAN RAMSAY. The Ever Green, being a collection of Scots poems, wrote by the ingenious before 1600. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1724.

ALLAN RAMSAY. The Tea-Table Miscellany, or a collection of choice songs, Scots and English. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1724, 1727; 9th edition, enlarged with a fourth volume. London, 1740.

THOMAS PERCY. Reliques of Ancient English Poetry: consisting of old heroic ballads, songs, and other pieces of our earlier poets, together with some few of later date. 3 vols. London, 1765; 2nd ed., 1767; 3rd ed., 1775; 4th ed., 1794.

(Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript. Edited by J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall. 3 vols. 1867, 1868.)

DAVID HERD. The Ancient and Modern Scots Songs, Heroic Ballads, etc., now first collected into one body from the various miscellanies wherein they formerly lay dispersed, containing likewise a great number of original songs from manuscripts never before published. Edinburgh, 1769.

Ancient and Modern Scottish Songs, Heroic Ballads, etc., collected from memory, tradition and ancient authors. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1776.

THOMAS EVANS. Old Ballads, historical and narrative, with some of modern date, now first collected and reprinted from rare copies. With notes. 2 vols. London, 1777; 2nd ed. 4 vols. London, 1784.

A new edition, revised and considerably enlarged from public and private collections, by his son, R. H. Evans. 4 vols. London, 1810.

JOHN PINKERTON. Scottish Tragic Ballads. London, 1781.

2nd ed. Select Scotish Ballads. Hardyknute: an Heroic Ballad, now first published complete; with other nine approved Scotish Ballads and some not hitherto made public, in the Tragic Style. 2 vols. (vol. I, Tragic Ballads; vol. II, Comic Ballads). London, 1783.

JOSEPH RITSON. A Select Collection of English Songs, with their original airs, and a historical essay on the origin and progress of national song. 3 vols. London, 1783.

The second edition, with additional songs, and notes. By Thomas Park. 3 vols. London, 1813.

JOSEPH RITSON. Ancient Songs, from the time of King Henry the Third to the Revolution. London, 1790 (Printed, 1787; dated, 1790; published, 1792).

2nd ed. Ancient Songs and Ballads from the Reign of King Henry the Second to the Revolution. 2 vols. London, 1829.

JOSEPH RITSON. Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry: from authentic manuscripts and old printed copies. London, 1791; 2nd ed. London, 1833.

JOSEPH RITSON. Robin Hood: A collection of all the ancient poems, songs, and ballads, now extant, relative to that outlaw: to which are prefixed historical anecdotes of his life. 2 vols. London, 1795: 2nd ed. London, 1832.

(ii) *Authorities.*

WALTER SCOTT. (In his Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border.) (i) Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad. 1802. (ii) Introductory Remarks on Popular Poetry. 1830.

WILLIAM MOTHERWELL. Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern, 1827. With an historical Introduction.

HALES and FURNIVALL. (In their edition of Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript, vol. II.) Essay on the Revival of Ballad Poetry in the eighteenth century. London, 1868.

HUGH WALKER. Three Centuries of Scottish Literature. 2 vols. Glasgow, 1893. (Vol. I, Chap. V.)

W. L. PHELPS. The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement. Boston, 1893. (Chap. VIII.)

T. F. HENDERSON. Scottish Vernacular Literature. A history. London, 1900. (Chap. XI.)

FRANK SIDGWICK. Popular Ballads of the Olden Time. First series. London, 1903. (Introduction.)

HENRY A. BEERS. A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1899. (Chap. VIII.)

HANS HECHT. Songs from David Herd's Manuscripts. 1904. (Introduction.)

GRACE R. TRENERY.

LIVERPOOL.

A SIDELIGHT ON THE *TRISTAN* OF THOMAS.

Prof. Rajna's highly interesting and exhaustive treatment in *Romania*[1] of two Italian coverlets adorned with scenes from the story of Tristram adds to the striking testimony already afforded by the remains of secular medieval art to the extraordinary vogue of that story. Prof. Golther mentions in his book, *Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters*[2], six series of illustrations of the romance, outside of illuminated manuscripts, which have reached us in a more or less complete form through the centuries. Three others have come under my notice, including Prof. Rajna's coverlets and the subject of this paper. I doubt whether any other romance can show, apart from manuscripts, half that number of illustrative series. I tabulate below these nine groups of Tristram scenes in the order of their making.

	Date	*Place*	*Country of Origin*
Chertsey Tiles[3]	ca. 1275	British Museum	England
Ivory Casket[4]	1300—25	Hermitage Museum, Petrograd	France
Tapestry[5]	1300—25	Kloster Wienhausen, near Celle	Germany
Tapestry[6]	1300—25	Kloster Wienhausen, near Celle	Germany
Table Covering[7]	ca. 1350	Erfurt Cathedral	Germany
Embroidered Hanging[8]	14th c.	South Kensington Museum	Germany
Mural Painting[9]	ca. 1390	Schloss Runkelstein, near Bozen	Tyrol
Coverlets[10]	1350—1400	South Kensington Museum, and Usella	South Italy or Sicily
Tapestry[11]	1539	Kunstgewerbe Museum, Dresden	Germany

[1] *Romania*, 1913, p. 517. [2] pp. 408—12.
[3] M. Shurlock, *Tiles from Chertsey Abbey*.
[4] F. Michel, *Tristan*, I, p. lxxiii.
[5] *Archiv für Niedersachsens Kunstgeschichte*, II, Pl. 6; and J. Lessing, *Wandteppiche und Decken*, Pl. 12, 13.
[6] *Archiv für Niedersachsens Kunstgeschichte*, II.
[7] *Anzeiger der Kunde der Deutschen Vorzeit*, 1866, p. 14.
[8] D. Rock, *Textile Fabrics*, p. 77.
[9] J. V. Zingerle, *Freskenzyklus des Schlosses Runkelstein*.
[10] *Romania*, 1913, p. 517.
[11] *Germania*, XXVIII, p. 1. I have tried to make as complete a list as possible, but have excluded cases where the identification of the subject has been rashly assumed: for

Among the scenes on the Petrograd casket and the Runkelstein paintings is one which enjoyed a remarkable independent popularity—the assignation of the lovers, which King Mark watches from the branches of a tree. This scene was a special favourite with French craftsmen, for it appears on French ivory caskets of the early fourteenth century in the South Kensington Museum[1], the British Museum[2], the Metropolitan Museum, New York[3], at the Schloss Kirche, Cracow[4], and on one figured in John Carter's *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture.* Other French illustrations of the fourteenth century are three ivory mirror-cases, one originally in the Collection Spitzer[5], one in the Vatican Library[6], the third in the Musée de Cluny, a leather case for writing tablets at Namur[7], and a wooden box in the South Kensington Museum[8]. A French comb dating from the early fifteenth century is in the possession of the Bamberg Historical Society[9], and a carved corbel of about 1450 is in the house of Jacques Cœur at Bourges[10]. An English example of the subject is found on a misericord at Chester Cathedral[11], and a German on a tapestry in the town hall of Ratisbon[12].

The Chertsey Tiles have long been known to students of medieval art and archaeology, but seem to have escaped altogether the notice of students of medieval literature. They possess great interest as the earliest illustrations of the romance outside the manuscripts, and as the finest examples of tile-pavement design known. For the student of the romances they have the added value of following closely the version of Thomas (so far as we know it from the Norwegian and Middle English redactions, Gottfried von Strassburg, and the Oxford *Folie Tristan*), and of supplementing in a few details the evidence in regard to that version. While acknowledging the extensive scholarship

instance, the mural paintings at Florence mentioned in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, Ser. IV, vol. VI, p. 235. The tapestry at Langensalza mentioned by A. Schultz in his *Deutsches Leben im XIV. und XV. Jahrhundert*, p. 91, has attached to it a fragmentary inscription bearing the names of the lovers, but itself illustrates the legend of St Eustace. The scenes on an ivory comb (illustrated in Suchier, Birch-Hirschfeld, *Französische Literatur*, ed. 1913, p. 117) are simply conventional love scenes with no special relation to Tristram.

[1] W. Maskell, *Ivories in South Kensington Museum*, p. 64.

[2] O. M. Dalton, *Catalogue of Ivory Carvings in British Museum*, p. 125; *Burlington Magazine*, V, p. 303.

[3] *Collection Spitzer*, I, Pl. 21.

[4] *Romanische Forschungen*, V, p. 255.

[5] *Collection Spitzer*, I, p. 49; Molinier, *Arts Appliqués*, I, Pl. 29.

[6] *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, Ser. III, vol. XXXIII. p. 399.

[7] Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire d'Architecture*, IV, p. 505.

[8] No. 2173. '55.

[9] Becker and Hefner, III, Pl. 13; Suchier, Birch-Hirschfeld, *Französische Literatur*, ed. 1913, I, p. 115; Hefner Alteneck, ed. 2, vol. IV, Pl. 252.

[10] Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de Mobilier*, II, p. 157.

[11] *Chester Archaeological Journal*, V, p. 1.

[12] *Germania*, XVIII, p. 276.

and sound judgment which are embodied in M. Bédier's monumental reconstruction of Thomas's *Tristan* for the Société des Anciens Textes Français, I believe that it requires revision in three minor points in the light of this evidence.

The Chertsey Tiles were recovered in a fragmentary state over fifty years ago from the site of Chertsey Abbey. Dr Manwaring Shurlock, their discoverer, made a large collection of them, which is now deposited in the British Museum. The tiles on which Tristram scenes occur are for the most part round, and about nine and a half inches in diameter. They are of a dark terra cotta colour, with the design inlaid in white clay. Their date, according to the evidence of the armour depicted on them, lies between 1270 and 1280.

In 1885 Dr Shurlock published a handsome monograph entitled *Tiles from Chertsey Abbey.* It is unsatisfactory, however, from two points of view: the plates are not accurate reproductions of the tiles, and much of the text is worthless since the identification of the scenes is based on Walter Scott's edition of *Sir Tristrem.* The latter defect was to a large extent remedied in a recent article on these tiles by Prof. Lethaby in the Second Annual volume of the Walpole Society. I had been working independently at the identification of the subjects, and our results have been in most cases similar; but in no instance where I have found that our results differed, have I seen reason to change my first conclusion. I give below a summary of the results of my attempt to identify the tiles with the aid of the four derivatives of Thomas—the Saga, *Sir Tristrem,* Gottfried von Strassburg, and the Oxford *Folie Tristan.* In some cases I have had to resort to mere guesswork, and these I have indicated by an asterisk. The scenes are given in the order of their occurrence, and the numbers are those of Shurlock's plates[1]. The letters refer to five fragments at the British Museum, of which Shurlock gives no illustration. The page references are to Bédier's *Tristan,* volume I.

		PAGES
*32	Rivalen receives a message that his lands are invaded . . .	19
*A	The boy Tristram is trained in archery	29
1	Tristram plays chess with the Norse merchant	34
*B	A huntsman sounds the mort of the deer	47
20	The huntsmen bring Tristram before Mark	49
2	Tristram plays the harp before Mark	52
4	The porter of Mark's castle opens to Roald	57

[1] The plates which illustrate the romance of *Richard Cœur de Lion,* and those which represent combats or hunting scenes which seem to have no clear connection with either romance, I have omitted from consideration.

		PAGES
39	The lords of Ermenie do homage to Tristram	64
*7, *10	Tristram stands before Duke Morgan	65
9	Tristram draws on Duke Morgan	66
11	The barons of Cornwall and their children lament the prospect of separation	79
C	They implore the drawers of lots to have mercy on them	79
5	Mark kisses Tristram, who has accepted the challenge of Morhaut	80
6	The barons and their children follow suit	81
*D	The ambassadors of Gormon before Mark	81
12	Morhaut wounds Tristram in the thigh	87
13	Tristram deals Morhaut his death-blow	88
14	Morhaut's body is carried from the scene of combat	89
*8, *27	Gormon runs to see the body of Morhaut lying in state	90
15	Mark visits Tristram, who is suffering from the wound of the poisoned sword	92
24	Tristram, adrift in a boat, solaces himself with his harp	93
25	Tristram teaches Isolt to play the harp	97
*E	Tristram lands at Tintagel	103
*36	He rides up to the castle	103
17, 18	Tristram encounters the dragon	116
3, 21	He gives his gage to Gormon	129
26	Tristram returns with Isolt to Cornwall	143
37	He offers the love philtre to Isolt	144
16	Tristram in disguise comes to Isolt to carry her across the river	208

Let us now take up the discussion of the three points on which the evidence of the tiles inclines me to differ from M. Bédier's reconstruction of Thomas. Turning first to Plate 20, there can be no question, I think, that this represents the huntsman with the 'stake gift' in his hand, pointing out Tristram, who kneels behind him, as a master of the craft of venery. Now let us note the two standing figures on the left, one of whom is distinguished by his scrip and bourdon as a pilgrim. The Saga expressly says that the pilgrims accompanied Tristram to Mark's court[1]. M. Bédier has omitted this detail without assigning a reason. Until the omission is justified, I must believe that Thomas included the pilgrims in the triumphal return from the hunt.

M. Bédier, on page 61 of his reconstruction, describes the shield of Tristram as blazoned with the figure of a boar. He bases this on Gottfried's description of Tristram's cognizance (line 9490), and on the fact that in the Saga, chapter LI, Mariadoc has a dream of a boar, which is interpreted as a symbol of Tristram. Neither of these pieces of evidence is at all conclusive. On the other hand, Plates 12 and 13 of

[1] Ed. Koelbing, chap. xxi, p. 23, ll. 9—11.

the Chertsey Tiles both represent Tristram bearing a lion rampant on his shield. *Sir Tristrem*, describing the combat, says that Morhaut 'smot him in the lyoun, And Tristrem that was wiȝt, Bar him thurch the dragoun, In the scheld[1].' Finally the Saga itself, in the account of Tristram's knighting, says he was given a war-horse covered with a red housing, in which the figures of lions were worked in gold[2]. Now since it was frequently the custom to decorate the caparison of a knight with his armorial emblem, this last piece of evidence is highly significant, and, taken in conjunction with the testimony of *Sir Tristrem* and the tiles, seems to establish the fact that Thomas assigned the royal beast to his hero as his cognizance[3].

Let us turn now to Plate 24. This illustration of Tristram's first voyage to Ireland shows him alone in the boat. M. Bédier, on the authority of Gottfried and *Sir Tristrem*, supplies him with Governal as companion[4]. On the other hand, besides the evidence of the tile, the Oxford *Folie Tristan*, of which M. Bédier himself says that 'les allusions concordent toujours avec la version de Thomas[5],' supports the version of the solitary voyage. The testimony of these two, which closely follow Thomas, is certainly to be preferred to that of the very free redactions of Gottfried and the Middle English poet; and we should have no hesitation in maintaining that they represent here the original account of Thomas, were it not for the fact that the Saga gives us pause. Brother Robert, without stating explicitly that Tristram had companions, or who they were, says[6]: 'Now they were driven about on the sea by storm and wave so long that they knew not where they were: at last, however, they reached Ireland.' This use of the plural is surprising, since during the ensuing visit to Ireland Tristram alone is mentioned: there is no hint of any companions. If we regard for a moment the account of the voyage which scholars have ascribed to Thomas's hypothetical source, we find them in entire agreement on the point that in that source, the voyage was conceived of as a solitary and aimless drifting, which by accident brought Tristram to Ireland. That this was also the conception of the tile designer may be

[1] St. xcv, ed. Koelbing, ll. 1040—43.

[2] Ed. Koelbing, chap. xxiv, p. 27, ll. 12—14. For examples of horse trappings bearing arms of the owners, see J. R. Green, *Short History of England*, illustrated ed., 1, pp. 236, 239, 293.

[3] According to a list of the arms of King Arthur's Knights contained in an early 16th century edition of *Gyron le Courtois*, Tristram bore 'de sinople a ung lyon dor arme et langue de gueulles.' But King Réné in the *Livre du Cuer d'Amours*, ed. Quatrebarbe, p. 114, describes Tristram's shield thus 'd'or à une bande de pourpre.'

[4] p. 93. [5] p. 145, note.

[6] Ed. Koelbing, chap. xxx, p. 38, ll. 1—3.

inferred from the fact that two extant fragments of inscriptions belonging to the Chertsey Tiles bear the words, in one case SANS : GOVERNAIL, and, in the other, SANS : GUVERNAIL, referring doubtless to the rudderless boat. Since, therefore, the version of Thomas's original and the versions of the *Folie Tristan* and the tiles, both of which conform closely to Thomas, agree on this point, is it not probable that they give Thomas's own version, and that the embarrassing plural of the Saga is due simply to a mistranslation of an impersonal construction or other vague expression used by Thomas? The theory of such a slight blunder on the part of Brother Robert seems to me more plausible than the theory that he omitted to mention at the outset of the voyage and throughout Tristram's Irish sojourn the companions with which, according to M. Bédier, Thomas provided him—a theory which also involves the assumption that *Sir Tristrem* and Gottfried's *Tristan*, which abound in obvious departures from the original, should here have preserved the original version, while the comparatively faithful *Folie Tristan* and Chertsey Tiles abandoned it[1].

ROGER S. LOOMIS.

URBANA, ILLINOIS.

[1] In the series of philological studies issued by the University of Illinois I am hoping to publish a full account of the tiles accompanied by reproductions, in which the defects of Dr Shurlock's monograph will to some extent be remedied; and I shall gratefully acknowledge any corrections or improvements which readers of the present preliminary article can suggest to me.

FOUR 'CHANSONS DE GESTE': A STUDY IN OLD FRENCH EPIC VERSIFICATION[1].

The four 'chansons de geste' that we have studied illustrate all the resources of the system of versification used in the Old French epic poetry, but they afford but slight clue to the origin of the system. The mono-assonancing strophe, the refrain, the *laisses similaires* and the linking of the strophes are present already in the oldest and roughest of the four, and though, as we have seen, these characteristics differ somewhat from epic to epic, the differences are not such as to throw much light on the previous history of the versification; they are imputable rather to a varying degree of skill in the individual poets, or to the slow transformation of the system under the pressure of the new ideals of the twelfth century.

In those four masterly volumes of the *Légendes Epiques*[2] Professor Bédier has recently demonstrated how greatly the epic poets of mediaeval France were indebted to the church for their audiences, their subjects and their inspirations. Do they also, as one passage of his fourth volume would seem to suggest, owe to the clerks their system of versification[3]?

I venture to doubt. In the simple dignity and reserve of its style, perhaps also in its handling of the deca-syllabic line, the *Alexis* is indeed a true precursor of the *Roland*; it bridges over the gap that lies

[1] Continued from *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. IX, p. 52.

[2] *Les Légendes Epiques. Recherches sur la Formation des Chansons de Geste.* Paris. 1908–1913.

[3] The whole question of the versification lay outside the scope of Professor Bédier's inquiry. The passage in question runs as follows: 'Placer au XI^e siècle la naissance des chansons de geste, c'est dire que les âges antérieurs n'ont pas légué au XI^e siècle des poèmes tout faits, mais seulement, par l'œuvre des clercs, quelques-unes des idées qui, l'heure venue, inspireront les chansons de geste, et quelques-uns des procédés de versification, qui, l'heure venue, constitueront la technique des chansons de geste. Le fait que l'heure n'est venue qu'au XI^e siècle n'implique point d'ailleurs que le genre littéraire des chansons de geste sont une *proles sine matre creata*....Pour constituer le système de versification des premières chansons de geste, n'a-t-il pas fallu que le vers décasyllabique et le couplet sur une seule assonance fussent d'abord maniés et assouplis dès le XI^e siècle par le poète de la *Vie de saint Alexis*, dès le X^e par le poète du *Boèce* provençal?' (*Op. cit.* vol. IV, pp 462–3.)

between the ruder *Chanson de Willelme* and Turold's poem; but neither the *Alexis*, nor the *Boethius*, much less the earlier *St Leger* or *Passion*, furnish any clue to the origin of the versification of the 'chansons de geste.' The metrical system of the two types of poem is too dissimilar. Mono-assonancing strophe and deca-syllabic line indeed occur in both, but all the more specific characteristics of the epic system—refrain, *laisses similaires* and linking of the strophe—are lacking in these early monuments of the clerical poetry.

Alien as they are to contemporary or earlier clerical poetry, however, these metrical *procédés* are by no means the exclusive property of the 'chanson de geste.' They belong equally or even more distinctively to another and far more widely diffused type of verse. The *Willelme*, as we saw[1], reminded us unmistakeably of the ballad, and in nothing is this likeness so pronounced as in this matter of versification.

Refrain, *laisses similaires*, linking of the strophe as well as the mono-assonancing strophe, all characterise much ballad poetry, in particular that of the Romance, British and Scandinavian countries. Younger than the 'chanson de geste,' for the oldest extant ballads of these regions go back only to the thirteenth century[2], still a living *genre* in out of the way parts of the world such as the Faroe Islands and only very recently obsolete in others, the ballads afford a wealth of material for the investigator that has enabled him to solve the problem of their origin and trace the development of all their metrical characteristics.

A comparative study of the versification of the 'chansons de geste' and of the ballad may serve therefore—not only to establish the likeness in the technique of the two *genres*, but also to throw light on the origin of these epic characteristics.

The mono-assonancing or mono-rhyming strophe is so marked a feature of early ballads that illustration hardly appears necessary[3]. In later ballads the assonancing (rhyming) couplet is often lengthened by the addition of two assonance-less (rhyme-less) lines, but this four-lined strophe is generally admitted to be a variant of the simple two-lined type.

The refrain is another salient ballad characteristic, but the relationship of ballad refrain to the epic type appears to me to require careful

[1] *M.L.R.* VIII, p. 365.

[2] The oldest extant Danish ballad is in a thirteenth century MS.; the oldest extant Icelandic refrain can be traced back to 1264; the oldest English ballad, if *Judas* be so reckoned, is of the thirteenth century also. Extant French ballads appear to be later.

[3] Cf. *Judas*, *Gil Brenton*, *Willie's Lady*, *Earl Brand*, etc.

study. The equivalence of the two *procédés* can certainly not be taken for granted: indeed it would rather appear to me that the name 'refrain' is a misnomer as applied to the epic type, and that we must look elsewhere for its ballad counterpart.

In all probability the refrain originally formed an integral part of the ballad type of Great Britain, Scandinavian and the Romance countries[1]; it is still found frequently in the older British ballads and almost consistently in those of the other two regions. In form and function it varies very considerably. At times a mere meaningless iteration of sounds—*fa la la la, fa la la la ra re*; *ba ba lilla ba*, etc., it merely terminates or interpunctuates the strophe; at others it supplies the setting or the key-note of the ballad, concentrating in itself often the joyousness or horror or foreboding of the whole poem:

Robin lyeth in grene wode bounden.
* * * * * *
And we'll never gang down to the brune onie mair.
* * * * * * * * * *
The wind blows cold, the wind from the sea.
* * * * * * * * *
Nothing for them was shapen but to sunder.

In form the refrain is usually but not invariably independent of the rest of the strophe and ordinarily remains invariable throughout the poem, but there are instances such as *Lord Randal* (12)[2], *Sir Lionel* (18c), *The Fair Flower of Northumberland* (9) and others in which it is adapted to the strophe. Thus in *Lord Randal* the line ending the first five strophes, 'For I'm wearied wi hunting and fain would lie down,' is changed to 'For I'm rich at the heart, and I fain wad lie down' in the remaining five, while in *The Fair Flower of Northumberland* the refrain line changes slightly more than a dozen times.

Among the 'chansons de geste,' as we have seen[3], the three oldest alone show any trace of a refrain or what may be considered a refrain, and it is the *Roland* type alone that at all resembles the ballad refrain in regularity of use and in function. The 'Aoi' that stands at the end of the *laisses* in the poem is certainly reminiscent of the meaningless type of ballad refrain.

The so-called refrains of the *Willelme* and the *Gormond et Isamberd*,

[1] German ballads show little or no trace of it. Cf. Professor Ker's articles in the *Scottish Historical Review*, July 1904 and 1908.

[2] The numbers placed after the ballad names are those assigned to the ballads in Child's edition. Quotations are taken from the *English and Scottish Popular Ballads, edited from the Collection of Francis James Child*, by Helen Child Sargent and George Lyman Kittredge.

[3] *M.L.R.* VIII, pp. 364–5.

on the other hand, differ from those found in the ballad both in irregularity of use and in function. In the former poem, it will be remembered, there often occurs repeated a couplet 'lunsdi al vespre' or 'juesdi al vespre' assonancing with a varying deca-syllabic line connected in significance with the preceding strophe; in the latter the quatrain:

Quant il ot mort le bon vassal,
Ariere enchaça le cheval
Puis mist avant sun estandart,
Nem (uem?) la li baille un tuenart.

is placed after each of the pagan king's exploits. The adaptation of refrain to strophe, that is seen in the *Willelme*, is, as we saw above, paralleled in the ballad refrain but neither the irregularity of appearance nor the function of these strophes. In the *Gormont* fragment certainly, and it appears to me also in the *Willelme*[1], these recurring lines are of the nature of transitional strophes; they serve to mark off the end of one scene and lead on to the following.

This surely is no refrain function, but the *procédé* itself is one to which ballad poetry furnishes an exact counterpart. Longer ballads contain not infrequently a strophe that repeated in identical or almost identical form concludes one episode and sets the next in train. *Tam Lin* (39), *The Boy and the Mantle* (29), and *Archie o' Cawfield* (188) all exemplify this well. In *Tam Lin* the third strophe is repeated twice in identical and once in slightly modified form:

Janet has kilted her green kirtle
A little aboon her knee,
And she has broded her yellow hair
A little aboon her bree,
And she's awa to Carterhaugh
As fast as she can hie. (cf. 8 and 17.)

In the *Boy and the Mantle* (29) each lady's discomfiture is followed by the strophe:

Shee threw downe the mantle,
that bright was of blee,
Fast with a rudd redd
to her chamber can shee flee, (*vv.* 13, 20, 24.)

while likest perhaps of all to the spirited *Gormond* quatrain, though rather more varied in form, are the four recurrent lines of *Archie o' Cawfield* (188):

There was horsing and horsing of haste,
And cracking o whips out oer the lee,
Till they came to fair Barngliss,
And they ca'd the smith right quietly. (*v.* 8 of A.)

[1] The text is so corrupt that it is difficult to form a judgment.

There was horsing and horsing of haste,
And cracking of whips out o'er the lee,
Until they came to the Bonshaw wood,
Where they held their council privately.
(*v.* 10 and very similarly *vv.* 13, 29, 34 of A.)

The *laisses similaires* of the epics we have studied may conveniently be divided into two types. In the one we have set before us a repeated action, the representation of two, three or more separate but similar acts, described each in separate but similar *laisses*; in the other the poet gives us the detailed description of one single action or emotion. In the *laisses similaires* of the first type it is the kind of action that is the determining factor; the form follows the subject; as each act normally fills a strophe[1], a succession of separate but like acts brings a succession of separate but like strophes. Of such a kind, in the four epics we have studied, are the *laisses similaires* describing Roland's three attempts to break Durendal, or Oliver's three requests to him to sound the horn, or those detailing the arrival of the separate members of the 'Willelme geste.' Elsewhere too examples abound, as for instance in *Aimeri de Narbonne*[2] the strophes containing Charlemagne's appeal to each one of the peers to take Narbonne; in *Raoul de Cambrai*[3] those describing Raoul's pursuit of Ernaut de Douai and his overthrowal, one by one, of the knights that intervene to stop him.

The second type shows further development in the art of composition. It is one and the same action or emotional crisis that is depicted, but bit by bit only; the act gradually revealed in its entirety, the emotion under its different aspects. It is not the course of the incident itself that necessitates the use of *laisses similaires*, but rather the poet's method of representing it to us. It is his way of heightening or prolonging a crisis. After this manner are both the death of Vivien and William's sorrow over it described in the *Chanson de Willelme*; thus does the *Roland* poet elaborate Ganelon's praise of Charlemagne and Charlemagne's sorrow for Roland, and so in all the numerous *regrets* of the 'chansons de geste.'

The term *laisse similaire* is unfamiliar to ballad readers and students, but the *procédé* itself is as well known to them as was the use of prose to M. Jourdain. The two types of the 'chanson de geste' both find their counterparts in the ballad, only for the most part in far

[1] Cf. above, *M.L.R.* VIII, p. 353.
[2] Ed. Demaison, *S.A.T.F.*
[3] Ed. P. Meyer and A. Longnon, *S.A.T.F. laisse* CXLIII, *et seqq.*

greater profusion. Long undistinguished from other types of repetition, however, they remained in anonymity and comparative obscurity until Professor Gummere revealed their importance in the question of origins and bestowed on them the name of 'incremental repetition[1].'

Laisses similaires of the second epic type are relatively somewhat rarer in ballad poetry than in the 'chanson de geste.' The ballad poet rarely spends his strength in description of any kind, least of all of an emotion; rarely too makes use of any *procédé de style.* Yet among the Scotch ballads there is preserved one typical regret—*The Bonny Earl of Murray* (181 A):

He was a braw gallant,
And he rid at the ring;
And the bonny Earl of Murray,
Oh he might have been a king!

He was a braw gallant,
And he play'd at the ba;
And the bonny Earl of Murray
Was the flower among them a'.

He was a braw gallant,
And he play'd at the glove;
And the bonny Earl of Murray,
Oh! he was the Queen's love!

and the use of the device to heighten a crisis is well within the range of even the balladist's simple art:

O lang, lang may their ladies sit,
Wi thair fans into their hand,
Or air they se Sir Patrick Spence
Cum sailing to the land.

O lang, lang may the ladies stand,
Wi thair gold kems in their hair,
Waiting for thair ain deir lords,
For they'll se thame na mair[2].

* * * * * *

Aft I have ridden thro Stirling town
In the wind bot and the weit;
Bot I neir rade thro Stirling town
Wi fetters at my feet.

Aft have I ridden thro Stirling town
In the wind bot and the rain;
But I neir rade thro Stirling town
Neir to return again[3].

[1] Gummere, *The Beginnings of Poetry*, p. 194, and *The Popular Ballad*, p. 96. In the degenerate later ballads the incremental repetition sinks into a grotesque commonplace, rarely, if ever, paralleled in the epic.

[2] *Sir Patrick Spens* (58 A), *vv.* 9 and 10.

[3] *Young Waters* (94), *vv.* 11 and 12.

The first type of *laisses similaires* meets us at every turn: similar, repeated acts, described in closely similar strophes, make the staple of many a ballad. Lady Isabel takes three steps (4 B), May Collin casts off three garments (4 H), 'the banisht man' slays his three sisters (*Babylon* 14 A), Lady Margaret falls low in supplication before father, mother and sister (*Hind Etin* 41, strophes 34, 36, 38), the maid freed from the gallows addresses her entreaties to each of her family in turn (95):

Oh father, oh father, a little of your gold
And likewise of your fee!
To keep my body from yonder grave,
And my neck from the gallows-tree.

None of my gold now you shall have,
Nor likewise of my fee;
For I am come to see you hang'd,
And hanged you shall be....

Oh mother, oh mother, etc.

The 'close pattern of ballad stuff,' as Gummere styles it[1], the older the ballad the more dominant this type of repetition is seen to be.

Differences there are observable between the *incremental repetition* of the ballad and the *laisses similaires* of the 'chanson de geste,' but the divergence is one of degree, of stage of development, and not of type. In the more primitive form of the ballad reiteration is literal and insistent. The appeal is still through the cumulative effect of closely similar repetition. The *laisses similaires* of the 'chanson de geste' are the offspring of a more developed art. Simple iteration has become wearisome, and the poets, though still influenced by the old scheme of action and manner of representing action, strive after variation of form. From the incremental repetition of *Lady Isabel* or *Babylon* or *Young Waters* to the *laisses similaires* of the *Chanson de Roland*, from the naïve monotony of the *Maid Freed from the Gallows* or its Faroese counterpart to the noble dignity of Charlemagne's appeal to his peers, is a long step or rather series of steps. Yet between these types of scenes the relationship, however much masked by difference of treatment, is unmistakeable. Moreover in the oldest epic, the *Willelme*, the identity proclaims itself in their simplicity and literalness of repetition: its *laisses similaires* furnish the link between the ballad and epic types. We quoted previously[2] almost identical strophes relating Vivien's death; another equally striking instance is seen in those describing the separation of the valiant and the cowards:

[1] *The Popular Ballad*, p. 91. [2] *M.L.R.* VIII, p. 361.

Si cum s'esmieret li ors fors de l'argent,
Si s'en eslistrent tote la bone gent
Tuit li coart vont od Tiedbalt fuiant,
Ot Vivien remestrent li vaillant,
Communalment fierent al chief devant.

Si cum li ors fors de l'argent s'en turnet,
Si s'en eslistrent dunc tuit li gentil home.
Premierement ferirent en la pointe
Communalment ensemble li prodome[1].

So literal a repetition as is found in this passage, in the strophes describing Vivien's death, and in others in the poem, appears almost inexplicable until we have the ballad usage to compare with it[2].

The use of the *linked strophe* is a consistent characteristic of the versification of the 'chanson de geste,' but in the ballad poetry its use varies considerably in different countries. In some of the Romance and Scandinavian ballads, the *procédé* appears in a more systematic form than in any of the 'chansons de geste,' each strophe throughout the whole poem beginning with the literal repetition of the last line or two lines of the preceding one[3].

In the British group of ballads the linking of the strophe is a far less marked feature, but in form and function it more nearly resembles that of the 'chanson de geste.' It is never employed consistently throughout the whole poem, after the manner of these Romance and Scandinavian ballads, but it occurs sporadically in many of the larger ballads, in particular in their narrative prologues, and the amount of literal repetition varies in degree much as in the 'chansons de geste,' that we have studied. The range of type extends from examples as literal as those quoted above from the *Willelme*[4] to the more varied types of *Garin le Lorrain*[5].

(26) They had not ridden scant a myle,
A myle forth of the towne,
But in did come the king of Spayne
With trempës many a one.

(27) But in did come the kyng of Spayne
With manye a bold barone[6].
* * * * * *

(3) They guarded him, fivesome on each side,
And they brought him ower the Liddel-rack.

(4) They led him thro the Liddel-rack,
And also thro the Carlisle sands[7].
* * * * * * *

[1] ll. 330–339.
[2] Cf. above, *M.L.R.* viii, p. 362.
[3] Cf. Jeanroy, *Les Origines de la Poésie Lyrique en France*, 2nd ed., pp. 419–424. For Danish examples cf. Grundtvig, nos. 2, 3, 5 A, 4 C, and Hart, *Ballad and Epic*, Harvard Studies, xi, pp. 140, 141.
[4] Cf. *M.L.R.* viii, pp. 362 and 363.
[5] *M.L.R.* ix, p. 49.
[6] *King Estmere* (60).
[7] *Kinmont Willie* (186).

1. Willie has ta'en him oer the fame,
   He's woo'd a wife and brought her hame.

2. He's woo'd her for her yellow hair,
   But his mother wrought her mickle care.

3. And mickle dolour gard her dree,
   For lighter she can never be[1].

Yet another particular in which the British ballad type of linking resembles that of the 'chanson de geste,' is its likeness to the incremental repetition. In both ballad and epic it is often difficult to determine which of the two *procédés* we have before us, and indeed the one is probably derived from the other[2]. An example or two from each type of poem will exemplify the use sufficiently:

1. O Bessie Bell and Mary Gray
   They were twa bonnie lasses;
   They bigget a bower on yon burn-brae,
   And theekit it ower wi rashes.

2. They theekit it oer wi rashes green,
   They theekit it ower wi heather;...[3]
   * * * * * * *

3. He kyst adoun þe boris hed & went into þehalle;
   'I forsak þe, kyng Herowdes, and þi werkes alle.'

4. 'I forsak þe kyng Herowdes and þi werkes alle;
   þer is a chyld in Bedlem born is beter þan we alle[4].'

XLI. Joufrois parole, au roi proie merci:
'Drois emperere, malement sons bailli;
Por qu'as ostaiges cest malfé nos rendis,
Au plus felon qui ait hauberc vesti.
Mors est H., ainc tel baron ne vi,
De tout son fie vient estre ravesti.'

XLII. J. parole a l'aduré corage:
'Drois emperere, trop feïs grant folaige
Quant ton neveu donnas tel eritaige
Et d'autrui terre l'onnor et le fiaige.
Mors est H. qui menoit grant barnage.
R. a droit, vos en aveiz l'outraige...[5].'

Separated, then, as ballad and epic are by a long interval of time, differentiated as their technique is by the different kind of use that is made of it—serving as it does for allusive song in the one case and for narrative on a large scale in the other—the formal likeness that yet exists between them manifests itself clearly. In more primitive form,

[1] *Willie's Lady* (6), and cf. also *Dick o' the Cow* (185).
[2] For the origin of the consistent type, cp. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*
[3] *Bessie Bell and Mary Gray* (201).
[4] *St Stephen and Herod* (22), and cf. *Judas* (23), *vv.* 4 and 5, 14 and 15, 16 and 17.
[5] *Raoul de Cambrai*, and cf. *Covenant Vivien*, v and vi, xxii and xxiii, etc.

in different proportions, all the epic *procédés* that we have considered find their counterpart in the ballad verse.

Now recent investigation has left no room for doubt about the origin of the ballad structure: the ballad and all its specific metrical characteristics—incremental repetition, linking of the strophe as well as refrain—all have their beginnings in the mimetic choral dance, the dominant amusement, first of mediaeval France and then of many other countries.

The starting-point of the refrain and of that type of linking of the strophe found in the Portuguese ballads has long been seen to lie in the choral dance[1], but it is only recently that Professor Gummere has succeeded in tracing back *incremental repetition* to this same source and shown its paramount importance in the early ballad and its continuance in the later ballad structure. The interest of his studies to all students of the French epic is manifest. As we have seen, it is just in the *laisses similaires* that the likeness of technique between ballad and 'chanson de geste' is most solidly established, and if dance origin is conclusively proved for the one, it must be accepted also for the other.

Is this not a retrograde step? A return to the cantilènes, to the Merovingian or Carlovingian origin of the epic?—that theory of which Professor Bédier has so recently and convincingly disposed? Not so, I think. The technique of a poem is not the poem itself, and the versification of the 'chansons de geste' may have its beginnings far back in those early times and yet they may be as well as the Crusades 'les œuvres du XI^e^ and XII^e^ siècle[2].' Despite all similarity of technique, all likeness of origin, ballad is ballad and epic, epic; nor can the one become the other by any simple process of addition and development[3].

Yet, surely, it is not for nothing that the French epic bears the name of 'chanson de geste.' The lineal descendant of the people's song, it is still reminiscent in its repetitions of their simple pleasures and makes something of the old rhythmic appeal. The church, assuredly, counts for much in the making of the epic, but the poets after all, as M. Bédier tells us in another context, 'sont restés "peuple"[4],' and nowhere more than in their versification.

MILDRED K. POPE.

OXFORD.

[1] Cf. Jeanroy, *op. cit.*; cf. Doncieux: *Le Romancéro Populaire de France*, p. xix.
[2] Bédier, *op. cit.* IV, p. 462.
[3] Cf. Heusler, *Lied und Epos.*
[4] Bédier, *op. cit.* IV, p. 429.

DANTE'S 'GENTILE DONNA[1]'

II

In *Convivio* II, 13, Dante begins to expound the allegorical meaning of *Voi che intendendo*, and here we find another famous chronological indication. After saying that it was some time ('alquanto tempo') after the death of Beatrice that he undertook to read Boethius and the *De Amicitia*, the poet tells us that he found difficulty in understanding them, but, on persevering, his grief for the loss of his love ceased, as he began to appreciate the vast extent of the land of science into which he was with difficulty entering. In particular his mind became enamoured of Philosophy, of whom his books spoke so tenderly and reverently. He imagined her in the fashion of a 'donna gentile' who seemed to him ever full of pity. Then he began to frequent the schools of the religious orders and in 'picciol tempo, forse di trenta mesi' he became so well acquainted with the sweet nature of this lady 'che 'l suo amore cacciava e distruggeva ogni altro pensiero.' It was then that he wrote the poem *Voi che intendendo*.

The time when the love of Philosophy was in the act of driving away and destroying all other thoughts (notice the descriptive imperfects *cacciava e distruggeva*: not *cacciò e distrusse*) corresponds to the time mentioned in *Convivio* II, 2, when the 'gentil donna' 'apparve primamente accompagnata d'Amore agli occhi miei, e prese alcun luogo nella mia mente,' when unable to bear silently the struggle which was already ending with the victory of the new thought, he directed his voice toward the place whence proceeded 'la vittoria del nuovo pensiero, che era vittoriosissimo' (that is toward the sphere of Venus) and began to say 'Voi che intendendo ecc.'; hence it corresponds to the date given in that chapter: August 1293.

The 'trenta mesi' which are said to have led up to this event are reckoned by Zingarelli from the time when Dante had already finished

[1] Continued from *The Modern Language Review*, vol. x, p. 149.

the study of Boethius and Cicero[1], but Barbi argues reasonably that they should be reckoned from the beginning of that introduction into Philosophy[2]. The question, however, does not seem to be of the first importance. Between the death of Beatrice (June 1290) and the date of *Voi che intendendo*, as deduced from *Convivio* II, 2 (August 1293), there was an interval of thirty-eight months. If we count the 'trenta mesi' from the end of the study of Boethius and Cicero, we must suppose that that study occupied about eight months less the 'alquanto tempo' immediately after the death of Beatrice. If, on the other hand, we count the 'trenta mesi' from the beginning of the reading of Boethius, we must suppose that the 'alquanto tempo' was a period of about eight months. I say 'about' because Dante says '*forse* di trenta mesi.'

Barbi has well said that the two chronological indications (in *Convivio* II, 2, and II, 13) are neither parallel nor successive[3]. They are also different in kind. The first (*Convivio* II, 2) is an accurate date determined astronomically, and placed in the most important position at the beginning of the chapter. The second (*Convivio* II, 13) is a cursory estimate of time elapsed, which does not aim at accuracy, and yet, as we shall see, is quite truthful, so far as we can determine. Thirty months before August 1293 brings us to February 1291, so that Dante seems to mean that he began his philosophical studies in February of 1291, or a little before or after. It naturally occurs to one that the 'donna gentile' is represented in the *Vita Nuova* as appearing for the first time no earlier than June of 1291. Why this discrepancy, if so strong a term is allowable?

I see in this fact simply a proof of Dante's scrupulousness. He is speaking now no longer of his relations with the woman of flesh and blood, but giving us an account of his acquaintance with Philosophy. It would have been easy enough for him to say *ventisei mesi* instead of 'forse di trenta mesi,' and so make this account tally exactly with that of the *Vita Nuova*, but, as a matter of fact, he had begun to study philosophy about four months before meeting the 'donna gentile.' And although by August of 1293 the 'donna gentile' had become to him identified with Philosophy, that could not alter the fact that she had not become Philosophy in his mind until then.

The remainder of the passage, part of which I have just been discussing, has a peculiar interest. Immediately after the sentence

[1] *Dante*. Milano: F. Vallardi, p. 133.
[2] *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* XI, p. 11.
[3] *Loc. cit.*

containing the expression 'forse di trenta mesi,' occur the following words: 'Per chè io, sentendomi levare dal pensiero del primo amore alla virtù di questo, quasi meravigliandomi, apersi la bocca nel parlare della proposta Canzone, mostrando la mia condizione sotto figura d' altre cose; ....' By 'virtù di questo' is plainly meant the influence of the love of Philosophy, but what is meant by 'primo amore'? The answer one may expect, that these words refer to Dante's former love for Beatrice, is by no means satisfactory, for when we go on to the rest of the sentence we find that that interpretation will not altogether fit: 'però che de la donna di cu' io m' innamorava, non era degna rima di volgare alcuno palesemente poetare[1], nè gli uditori erano tanto bene disposti, che avessero sì di leggiere le fittizie parole apprese; nè sarebbe data loro fede a la sentenzia vera come a la fittizia, *però che di vero si credea del tutto che disposto fossi a quello amore, che non si credeva di questo.*' Flamini interprets the words beginning 'nè gli uditori' as meaning: 'nor would my hearers be sufficiently prepared, intellectually, to understand such a fiction as would be Philosophy represented, after the example of Boethius, as an ancient and venerable matron whose head touched the skies, who carried in her hand a sceptre' and so on, and the fiction would be no better understood than the truth intended to be conveyed[2].

One cannot help admiring this acute conjecture, which takes into account the fact that the poet has but recently related how he was introduced into the study of philosophy by the reading of Boethius, and which throws an entirely new light on the sentence: 'nè sarebbe data loro fede a la sentenzia vera come a la fittizia' by understanding a second negative in the latter part of it. However, the doubly negative idea is by no means obvious; at least, it is not necessarily implied by the words. And since Dante has just told us that from the beginning he had imagined Philosophy 'fatta come una donna gentile'—which expression immediately suggests to us the 'donna gentile' of the *Vita Nuova* and the *Convivio*, young and beautiful,—it is difficult to suppose that he is now telling us that he had thought of representing her as a

[1] For this part of the text cf. Flamini, *Le Opere Minori di D. A.*, vol. I. Livorno: Giusti, 1910, p. 141.

[2] Cf. *ed. cit.*, p. 141, nn. 41–2 and 42–3: 'nè coloro che son soliti ascoltare le mie parole per rima (aventi a soggetto l' amore verso una bella e giovine donna non imaginaria) erano nella buona disposizione intellettuale che sarebbe occorsa per intendere agevolmente...sì fatta finzione (della Filosofia rappresentata—come nel libro di Boezio—in figura d' una vecchia matrona veneranda, erigente il capo fino al cielo, con lo scettro nella sinistra ecc.) ...Nè sarebbero credute (le *fittizie* parole) quanto al loro significato di verità (cioè quanto all' amore del P. per la filosofia) così come non lo sarebbero quanto al fittizio (cioè quanto all' amore di lui per una figura fantastica quale s' è detto).'

venerable and gigantic person similar to Boethius' lady. And so, in spite of the respect which one naturally has for so valued an authority as is that of the editor, I am inclined to interpret the words of this passage in what seems to me a more obvious and less imaginative manner.

Convinced as he was that Philosophy could not be worthily sung in the vulgar tongue 'palesemente' (that is without allegory), Dante tells us that he made up his mind to disguise his meaning, 'sotto figura d' altre cose,' well knowing that his readers were not capable of penetrating the hidden meaning of the figurative language ('fittizie parole'), and content that they should take his words (which spoke of a love for a young and beautiful woman) as literally true: a thing they were naturally disposed to do, since they knew his former character and writings. And I should accordingly paraphrase the words beginning 'nè gli uditori ecc.' as follows: 'neither were my readers sufficiently prepared, intellectually, to understand so easily my figurative language; nor would they credit the true meaning as they would the figurative, for truly it was believed without question that I was disposed to that kind of love ('quello amore'), whereas it was not believed that I was disposed to this other kind ('questo').'

So, to return to my comment on this passage:—by 'questo amore' is again meant the new-found love for Philosophy; 'quello amore' no doubt has the same meaning as the 'primo amore' of the first part of the passage. But if 'quello amore' means the love for Beatrice, how can the poet say that the readers' belief that he was disposed to that love would induce them to give credence to the literal meaning of *Voi che intendendo* ('sentenzia fittizia') which relates how Dante is abandoning the love of Beatrice for that of the 'donna gentile'? Clearly we must understand something else by 'primo amore' than merely the love for Beatrice.

It is my belief that here in the allegorical exposition, the love for Beatrice, spoken of literally in the words of the poem, has, as might have been expected, taken on an allegorical significance. It signifies love of the well-understood kind between a man and a woman, the love felt by Dante the troubadour (to adopt an expression used by Rieger), a love which, no matter how noble and disinterested, is nevertheless very different from the new love for Philosophy—the love felt by Dante the philosopher. The readers could be counted on to understand his love for Beatrice and the 'donna gentile,' knowing him as they did[1], but

[1] All the more easily if the 'donna gentile' is 'Lisetta.'

they could not be expected to understand an altogether intellectual passion for Philosophy.

But—it will be objected—Beatrice herself does not appear to have an allegorical meaning, even in the allegorical exposition[1]. True, she has not, and the reason is that she no longer has any place, in any sense, in this autobiographical account. As early as *Convivio* II, 9, Dante has said that he does not intend to speak any more in this book of Beatrice: '... sarà bello terminare di quella viva Beatrice beata, della quale più parlare in questo libro non intendo,' and he has carried out his intention. Here in II, 13, there is no mention of her, but only the necessary reference to the former account of how 'per me fu perduto il primo diletto della mia anima[2],' and she is never even referred to again. There is much room for speculation as to whether Dante did not refrain from using Beatrice as a symbol here because he was reserving her for a more important part in another work, but at any rate the fact remains that 'quella viva Beatrice beata' is now completely lost sight of. She has been put aside because the poet is no longer concerned with women and love of them. This commentary is being written long after the poem *Voi che intendendo*, and longer still after the *Vita Nuova*[3].

The expression 'primo amore' itself is extraordinary enough to attract attention, for Dante has never used it before either in the *Vita Nuova* or in this work. Throughout the *Vita Nuova* love is one thing, one person; there is no possibility of two loves. His love for Beatrice is *the* love ('Amore') who directs the poet's attentions to the 'donne dello schermo'; who inspires all noble hearts; who is known to the ladies whom the poet addresses ('Donne che avete ecc.'), and when the 'donna gentile' appears, there is no question as to whether Dante shall yield to another love, but only whether this lady is 'accompagnata d' Amore' or not, and the new 'pensiero' argues: 'Tu vedi che questo è uno spiramento, che ne reca li desiri d' Amore innanzi.' Again, in the literal explanation of *Voi che intendendo* (*Convivio* II, 9) our author, anticipating the objection that 'Amore' cannot be in conflict with himself, takes pains to explain that love for the 'donna gentile' was

[1] Cf. Barbi in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* XII, pp. 206–7.

[2] He says 'diletto' (not 'amore') because his love for Beatrice continued after the delight of her presence was gone, and he says 'diletto della mia anima' because his love for Beatrice had always been with the 'fedele consiglio de la ragione' (*V. N.* II), and she was also 'donna de la mia mente.'

[3] I think I need not discuss the date of the composition of the *Convivio*, for I consider it established that the whole work was composed at any rate after the banishment of the author, consequently at least eight years after the writing of *Voi che intendendo*: cf. Zingarelli, *op. cit.* pp. 390–1.

the same love for Beatrice, transferred by the heavenly intelligences from a person who was dead to one who was living. It is true that in *Convivio* II, 2 occurs the expression 'nuovo amore,' but since it has been said just before that the 'donna gentile' had at last appeared in the company of 'Amore,' that expression evidently means only what is also meant by the words: 'Oi anima pensosa,—questi è un spiritel *novo* d'amore,' in the sonnet *Gentil pensero* which deals with the same subject as this passage in the *Convivio*, that is 'nuovo amore' means only a fresh manifestation of 'amore.' This is the traditional 'Amore' who is for Dante the troubadour and all his contemporaries 'tanquam centrum circuli,' constant and indivisible. Dante the philosopher, who first begins to unveil himself in *Convivio* II, 13, calls this love his 'primo amore,' and later in commenting on *Amor che nella mente*, when the secret is out, and all his readers know that the lady of whom he is singing is Philosophy, he calls his new love 'lo mio secondo amore[1],' and still later, in *Convivio* III, 3, he undertakes a scientific classification of different kinds of love.

When Dante wrote *Voi che intendendo*, no doubt the only allegory he intended was that the lady in the poem signified Philosophy, but by the time he was composing the prose of the *Convivio*, he had become thoroughly versed in the study of scholastic philosophy: he had had a vision of philosophical truth very different from the occasional glimpses of it which are reflected in the *Vita Nuova*, and, for that matter, different from the simple enthusiasm for Philosophy which appears in his first allegorical poem. He had become convinced that he had found the true way and the true love: this was his 'secondo amore' which was the 'amor' of the philosophers, a matter only remotely connected with sensuous love; it was not only love for Philosophy, it had become philosophic love[2]. He has refined his conception of love more and more, and is more and more bent on proving, for his own credit, his right to the title of 'Philosopher.' How far he has travelled since he was a 'troubadour of love,' is emphasized significantly in the words: 'Onde

[1] *Convivio* III, 1. It may be objected that these words occur in the *literal* explanation of *Amor che nella mente*, and it may be said that this fact robs them of any special significance. But I think not. Now that the allegorical meaning of *Voi che intendendo* has been explained, every reader of the *Convivio* shares with its author the knowledge that the lady is Philosophy, a knowledge which the reader of *Convivio* II, 2, had not. Nothing more natural then, than that Dante, who could not anticipate the discussion to arise centuries later, should use the expression 'secondo amore,' which would have sounded strange in the literal explanation of *Voi che intendendo*, but which does not in any way introduce allegory into the literal interpretation of *Amor che nella mente*.

[2] This is apparent in all the commentary on *Amor che nella mente*, even in the literal exposition, but especially in the allegorical which begins with chapter 11.

non si dee dicere *Filosofo* alcuno, che per alcuno *diletto* colla Sapienza in alcuna parte sia amico: siccome sono molti che si dilettano in dire Canzoni e di studiare in quelle, e che si dilettano studiare in Rettorica e in Musica, e l' altre scienze fuggono e abbandonano, che sono tutte membra della Sapienza.' And perhaps it is the same attitude of mind which prompted the verses to Cino: 'Io mi credea del tutto esser partito—da queste vostre rime, Messer Cino,—chè si conviene omai altro cammino—alla mia nave già lungi dal lito.' It was this later, more mature conception of love that caused him to see in *Voi che intendendo* the additional allegory by which his former love for Beatrice represents ordinary sexual love, although of a noble kind, and his new passion philosophic 'amor[1].'

This conception enabled him also to say truthfully in *Convivio* II, 2, that Beatrice still dwelt with his soul on earth ('in terra colla mia anima'), for the ordinary love for both the 'donna gentile' and Beatrice, had now long since passed away.

Dante had always known that the allegory hidden beneath the letter of the great classical works of literature was far superior to the superficial meaning: that was common mediaeval information. But when he had absorbed the learning derived from years of philosophical studies, and had reached the mature point of view which is to be seen in the *Convivio*, how much more important must have seemed to him the philosophical allegory he was illustrating in some of his love-poems, than the pitiful little love-stories expressed by the letter, those words which now seemed only important because they were 'fittizie': that is because they symbolically represented philosophic truths[2]! 'Potrà piacere o no quello che io penso,' says the future editor of the *Convivio*[3], 'che in qualche modo il Convivio rappresenti, nel concetto del Poeta, una seconda Vita Nuova, quella della Sapienza, contrapposta alla prima, di Beatrice; e che, come in questa tutto tende al punto decisivo dell' ispirazione delle *nuove rime*, in lode di Beatrice, così nel secondo trattato del Convivio il Poeta voglia dare un gran risalto

[1] His words in *Convivio* II, 13, betray a slight unconscious anachronism, for there he speaks as if he had already conceived of his love for Philosophy as philosophic love at the time when he had composed the 'canzone': a thing unlikely. So, too, his allegorical interpretation of the heavens (*Convivio* II, 14) is, no doubt, an afterthought.

[2] The definition of the adjective 'fittizio' in the dictionary of the Crusca (last edition) is as follows: 'Fatto, Composto, in modo, o Tale, da fingere o rappresentare il vero; Fatto ad arte. E per estensione: Non reale....Contrario di Vero e di Genuino.' Notice that the meaning 'Non reale....Contrario di Vero ecc.' is only an extension of the first, the important meaning. What is 'fittizio,' then, may or may not be true in itself, and the literal meaning of a poem is not declared false when it is called 'fittizio.'

[3] Parodi in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* XIII, p. 261.

al momento dell' ispirazione delle canzoni allegoriche, in lode della Sapienza.'

And yet, although, in his later work, Dante's preoccupation was his 'secondo amore,' the love for Philosophy, he nevertheless never denied the truth of the story of the 'donna gentile' in the *Vita Nuova*, but confirmed and completed it, as we have seen, refusing to detract in any way from that account. And no doubt it was his scrupulous honesty that influenced him in this, rather than the fact that it would have been difficult to deny facts known to so many of his Florentine contemporaries. But far removed, as he was now, from a passion for any living woman, and conscious of his own mental growth, he was anxious to defend himself against two misconceptions: first the misconception that his earlier love poems had been the result of 'passione' without 'nobiltà,' erotic expressions to be ashamed of, and secondly that he had been disloyal to the memory of Beatrice. To defend himself against the first, it was enough to demonstrate that 'virtù si è stata la movente cagione': the literal explanation of *Voi che intendendo*, for example, was sufficient to show that his love for the 'donna gentile' had been a worthy love, prompted by 'nobilissimo Amore,' and induced chiefly by the pitying attitude of the new lady. As to the second misconception, his defence was entrusted to the explanation of the allegory, which would show that the 'donna gentile' for whom he had deserted Beatrice was no mere woman, but to him no less a person than Philosophy: 'Dico che pensai che da molti retro da me sarei stato ripreso di levezza d'animo, vedendo me essere dal primo amore mutato. Per che, a torre via questa riprensione, nullo migliore argomento era, che dire qual era quella Donna che m' avea mutato.' (*Convivio* III, 1.) And so he declares again and again, in the most positive language possible, with the manifest intention of carrying absolute conviction to his readers' minds, that the lady in question was and is, to him, Philosophy. In these emphatic declarations there is not only the intention of convincing his readers, but also an honest satisfaction at being able to say truthfully that the lady was Philosophy. It was not that it had just occurred to him to make an allegorical symbol of the 'donna gentile,' but he had thought of her as Philosophy years before, when he had written the poem he is now explaining.

The allegorization of the 'donna gentile' begins with the 'canzone' *Voi che intendendo*, which is both literally and allegorically true. The reasons for accepting it as an expression of both literal and allegorical

truth have already been mentioned, and discussed as briefly as was possible, omitting, as was necessary, any historical sketch of the debate on these matters, which has been going on ever since the serious study of Dante's works began. It remains to examine, so far as we may, the state of mind which caused Dante to write in praise of the 'donna gentile' of the *Vita Nuova*, a poem in which she becomes the symbol of Philosophy[1]. Any conclusion, however, which may be drawn from such an investigation, must be largely conjectural. Two things are needed to make the conjecture acceptable: it must be in harmony with what information we have as to the poet's thoughts and feelings about the time when he wrote the poem, and it must destroy those apparent contradictions in Dante's words, which would otherwise remain, and which, nevertheless, are impossible. These are the merits which I claim for the conjecture I am about to propose.

We have seen that Dante began to read Boethius probably in 1291, and probably about four months before he met the 'donna gentile' for the first time. But it was not until after about thirty months of reading and studying that he became enamoured of Philosophy, in 1293. Meanwhile the 'donna gentile' had been summarily rejected with a valiant effort of the will, and under the inspiration of a powerful revival of memories of Beatrice, which prompted the author to compose the *Vita Nuova*, and to continue his studies with the hope of making them serve the greater glory of Beatrice[2]. But the influence of the 'donna gentile' (Lisetta?) was not destroyed. The struggle in the poet's mind began again and continued, as we are told in *Convivio* II, 2, the thoughts of the new lady becoming more and more insistent because Dante saw her often ('Perocchè l' uno era soccorso dalla parte dinanzi continuamente, ...E'l soccorso dinanzi ciascuno dì crescea')[3]. In 1293, about a year after he had finished the *Vita Nuova*, the struggle had become almost unendurable. All this time he had been reading philosophy. He had, some months before, found comfort for the loss of Beatrice in

[1] Those who have hitherto undertaken to explain the allegorization of the 'donna gentile,' generally take the ground that it was the result of advanced philosophical study such as is witnessed to by the prose of the *Convivio*. They neglect the fact that the lady is already allegorized in *Voi che intendendo* written ten years before the *Convivio*, and only about a year after the *Vita Nuova* was finished, and that, consequently, the mental attitude of the poet must have been nearer that which produced the *Vita Nuova* than that which produced the *Convivio*.

[2] There is no objection to placing the composition of the *Vita Nuova* within the early period of philosophical studies. Does not Dante say in § 42: 'E di venire a ciò io studio quanto posso'?

[3] Scartazzini (*Dante Handbuch*, 1892, III, Kap. 2.) and Fornaciari: (*Studi su Dante ecc.* Milano, 1883. La Trilogia Dantesca) both held that *Convivio* II contains a continuation of the story in the *Vita Nuova*.

the 'Consolation of Philosophy'; he was ingenuously affected by the power of soothing all disappointments and regrets attributed to her by Cicero; he admired the majestic figure of Philosophy in Boethius, but he preferred to imagine her as youthful and beautiful, like the young and noble lady who was never long absent from his mind. He reflected that she too, like Philosophy, was full of pity. Her gentle, sad and sympathetic face haunted him. All that she desired, it seemed, was to be his comforter, and he had dismissed her somewhat hastily, believing that he ought to, and could, forget her. He had turned his back on her partly from a sense of duty, and partly because he doubted the sincerity and unselfishness of her love, but it was now more than a year since then, and she was still there, meeting him often with the same kindly eyes. Who can tell whether the idea of accepting her as a symbol of Philosophy, as the Comforter incarnate, flashed upon him suddenly or came to him slowly? 'L' identità dell' ufficio, per così dire, produsse da principio una parziale compenetrazione e più tardi una fusione di quelle figure misericordiose' says Chistoni[1]. The fact is that in August of this year he became convinced for the first time that that Love which he had formerly thought of as defending the memory of Beatrice, was in the company of this pitying lady, and that therefore she was bound to overcome all resistance; for the first time his reason began to yield.

It was, I think, the idea of identifying the 'donna gentile' with Philosophy, that caused his reason to begin to yield. For, conceived of as Philosophy, she was no longer a dangerous temptress, no longer the adversary of reason. The intelligences of Venus, who, powerless to preserve love for souls who have departed this life, had, it seemed to him, transferred his love from the dead to the living woman (*Convivio* II, 9), and just as Beatrice had been, upon earth, a miraculous representative of divine grace, so this lady, who was offering herself for his consolation, just when Philosophy had begun to comfort him, might, in some equally miraculous way, be a true incarnation of Philosophy. When this idea occurred to him it seemed to show, at last, a way out of the quandary from which he had hitherto been unable to escape; it brought with it the prospect of relief from remorse and internal struggle; it promised to secure for him peace and happiness.

We have seen that August 1293 is the date when he became

[1] *La Seconda Fase del Pensiero Dantesco.* Livorno: Giusti, 1903, pp. 216–17. G. Zuccante repeats the expression in *Fra il Pensiero Antico e il Moderno*, Milano, Hoepli, 1905, pp. 232–3.

completely enamoured of Philosophy; that it is the date when the 'donna gentile' began to become *reasonably* acceptable to him; that it is the date when he wrote *Voi che intendendo*, in which poem the 'donna gentile' first appears as Philosophy. It must then, I think, be the date when the idea of identifying the lady with Philosophy first occurred to him. Truly a memorable date! and one worthy to be recorded at the beginning of the full account of the story, with the dignity of astronomical precision. It was then that he expressed his new idea and the certainty of his yielding to Love and Philosophy at the same time, the two miraculously united in one person, with the words: 'Amor, signor verace,—Ecco l' ancella tua; fa che ti piace.' He knew that his readers would not understand, that they would suppose he was announcing a new and not altogether creditable change of affection (*Convivio* II, 13), but he was content, for he was hugging to his heart the hidden meaning, the solution which was to satisfy his heart, mind, and conscience.

But, it will perhaps be said, granted that the idea described did really occur to the poet, would not he, in moments of cool reflexion, have rejected it as sophistry, as a mere excuse to accept what his heart desired, just as, in the *Vita Nuova*, he had rejected the plausible argument that love for the 'donna gentile' was the same as love for Beatrice? The answer is that the idea which he was now adopting was not another, but a development of that thought which he had formerly rejected as sophistry. It was the same thought ('gentil pensero') which had since gathered strength from reflexion on the simultaneous appearance of the comforting lady and Philosophy the comforter. He had only failed before to see what now he saw: that she was Philosophy, and that therefore Love had always been with her, and reason was bound to accept her. But there is more: let us not forget that when he was composing the *Vita Nuova*, with his new view of the character of Beatrice had come a new and astonishing insight into the significance of all the events of his young life that were connected with her. He had seen that his first sonnet contained an unconscious prophecy of her early death; that his loves for the 'donne dello schermo' had been really expedients of Love to protect from vulgarity his relations with Beatrice; that some of his verses written for those ladies contained curious references to his real love; that his vision of Beatrice preceded by Giovanna Primavera had been symbolic of their proper relation to each other. Above all he had been astounded by the coincidence of nines in the dates of events in his young life, and

had set himself to deduce, as well as he could, their significance. Now to the same mind, the coincidence of the two comforters, and the apparent confirmation of the old thought that the attraction of the new lady was only another manifestation of his love for Beatrice, would seem just as miraculous, just as providential as the coincidences of his 'vita nuova.' To a mediaeval scholastic mind a good analogy is a convincing argument, and here was analogy upon analogy, each complete in itself. And so, says the poet, '*quasi meravigliandomi*, apersi la bocca nel parlare della proposta canzone' (*Convivio* II, 13).

No one, I think, will consider it impossible or even unlikely that Dante should pursue at the same time two such absorbing interests as love and the study of philosophy. A man's studies and a genuine love for a woman are often mutually helpful: they only need to be connected by his imagination. In Dante, as we have seen, there were particular reasons for the existence of such a connexion, but the phenomenon has always been familiar. Petrarch and Boccaccio might be cited as good examples, and in more modern times one may point to another high mind and pure heart not unworthy of the tradition of Dante, who has testified repeatedly to the inspiring effect of the happy combination of love and study, a necessity to Alfieri: '.....e soltanto molti anni dopo mi avvidi, che la mia infelicità proveniva soltanto dal bisogno, anzi necessità ch' era in me di avere ad un tempo stesso il cuore occupato da un degno amore, e la mente da un qualche nobile lavoro; e ogni qual volta l' una delle due cose mi mancò, io rimasi incapace dell' altra[1].'

From what has been said it will be seen that I regard *Voi che intendendo* as the necessary connecting link between the *Vita Nuova* and the *Convivio*, in the chain of events and ideas of which the episode of the 'donna gentile' consists. In the *Vita Nuova* the lady is real; in the 'canzone' she is both reality and symbol, and here symbol and reality are equally important. In the *Convivio* the poet is obliged by his scrupulousness to explain her as both reality and symbol (had he had no conscience, and if his contemporaries could have been persuaded, he might well have so adjusted dates and information as to represent her as being but a symbol even in the *Vita Nuova*); yet when he has fulfilled his duty to the truth, by continuing the narrative of the earlier work and explaining the change by which his love for the 'donna gentile' had become 'perfetto,' he turns with relief and pleasure to the expounding of the symbol which was now far more important

[1] *Vita di Vittorio Alfieri ecc.*, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1893, p. 64.

to him, far truer, than the reality. For these reasons the 'donna gentile' in the *Convivio* is much more symbolic than real.

The temptation is strong to go on to speak of other matters connected with the subject of this essay: to discuss the other allegorical poems, especially *Amor che nella mente*, and the relation of the sonnets *Parole mie* and *O dolci rime* to *Voi che intendendo*, but I should be drawn into the question of the arrangement and interpretation of a large part of the 'canzoniere,' a problem which is in better hands than mine. I shall allow myself only a few words more, regarding the significance of the rebuke administered to Dante by Beatrice in *Purgatorio* XXX, XXXI, and XXXIII. It does not seem necessary to review the controversy on this question. I hold that the truth has been elicited that, as Barbi says[1], the offence for which the poet is reproved is one, namely that after the death of Beatrice he set his heart on worldly things. The whole matter is summed up in his confession: 'Le presenti cose col falso lor piacer volser miei passi,—Tosto che il vostro viso si nascose' (*Purgatorio* XXXI, 34–36). Under this head are included the two specific faults, that he had yielded to another and an earthly love, who was not, like Beatrice, a simple, unworldly inspiration of heavenly thoughts, and that he had devoted himself to the elusive pursuit of earthly wisdom, instead of trusting to the divine revelation for guidance[2]. As for the still prevalent opinion that the chief part of Dante's offence was sensual indulgence ('lussuria'), that has long seemed to me somewhat exaggerated. If he is still guilty of that sin, and if he is still charged with it by Beatrice, it hides its unimportance under the expression 'o altra vanità di sì breve uso' (*Purgatorio* XXXI, 60). That Beatrice is speaking of Dante's yielding to a living human temptation is evident from her mentioning the delight of 'le belle membra in ch' io Rinchiusa fui, e sono in terra sparte' as opposed to the attraction of the other 'cosa mortale.' It is not possible, however, to suppose

[1] Cf. his review of Scrocca, *Il Peccato di Dante*, in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* IX, pp. 30 f.

[2] *Purgatorio* XXX, 122–3: 'Mostrando gli occhi giovinetti a lui, Meco il menava in dritta parte volto.' The eyes of Beatrice are possibly the Old and New Testaments; cf. *Paradiso* V, 76–8 and 82–4: 'Avete il vecchio e il nuovo Testamento, E il pastor della Chiesa che vi guida: Questo vi basti a vostro salvamento....Non fate come agnel che lascia il latte Della sua madre, e semplice e lascivo Seco medesmo a suo piacer combatte.' The eyes of the 'donna gentile' (Philosophy) are 'le sue *dimostrazioni*, colle quali si vede la Verità certissimamente' (*Convivio* III, 15). Filomusi Guelfi in *Giorn. Dant.* XVII, 230, argues that in *Purgatorio* XXX, 126: 'Questi si tolse a me e diessi altrui,' *altrui* cannot refer to the 'donna gentile' because it cannot be feminine. My own impression is that *altrui* means *to another person*, with the necessary implication that that person is feminine. This use of the word is similar to that in *Inferno* XXX, 41: 'Falsificando sè in altrui forma,' and Guelfi's explanation of this latter sentence seems to me anything but satisfactory. Cf. also Petrarca, Son. *Pace non trovo*: 'Ed ò in odio me stesso, ed amo altrui.'

that he is being so thoroughly humiliated for an error which lasted only a few days ('alquanti die'), after which he had returned to Beatrice with a noble and impulsive enthusiasm. No, he had wandered again: 'Nè impetrare ispirazion mi valse, Con le quali ed in sogno ed altrimenti Lo rivocai'; vain had been the 'forte immaginazione' in which she had appeared to him with all the beauty of her early youth, vain the 'mirabil visione' when he had seen her in such guise as was beyond expression. 'Non ti dovea gravar le penne in giuso, Ad aspettar più colpi, o pargoletta.....'

On the other hand it is equally evident that the 'via non vera' was a way of the mind as well as of the heart: 'Sì tosto come in sulla soglia fui Di mia seconda etade, e mutai vita,' says Beatrice, and Dante confesses: 'Tosto che il vostro viso si nascose, ecc.' What offence had he committed so soon after her death, except that of seeking comfort in human philosophy, and pursuing it so eagerly that 'in picciol tempo, forse di trenta mesi' the love of it 'cacciava e distruggeva ogni altro pensiero'? The fact that the offence was chiefly intellectual and spiritual is abundantly shown, I think, by the additional rebuke in *Purgatorio* XXXIII, 85–90:

> 'Perchè conoschi,' disse, 'quella scuola
> Ch' hai seguitata, e veggi sua dottrina
> Come può seguitar la mia parola;
> E veggi vostra via dalla divina
> Distar cotanto, quanto si discorda
> Da terra il ciel che più alto festina[1].'

The most significant feature of the whole episode is, to me, that just as Dante, in *Voi che intendendo* and in the prose of the *Convivio*, represents as one experience his surrender to the 'donna gentile' and his conversion to the love of Philosophy, so does Beatrice in her rebuke[2].

The growth of Dante's philosophical knowledge, the fascination of which he describes to us in the *Convivio*, was accompanied by an insight

[1] Parodi (*Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* XVI, pp. 283–4) believes that these words have nothing to do with Dante's philosophical studies, and apply only to the question of imperial authority which Beatrice had been elucidating: 'la via tanto distante dalla divina quanto la terra dal Primo Mobile è quella dei teorici della supremazia papale,' but cf. Barbi in *Bull. d. St. Dant. It.* IX, p. 33. The words of vv. 67–9: 'E se stati non fossero acqua d' Elsa Li pensier vani intorno alla tua mente, E il piacer loro un Piramo alla gelsa,' seem to describe Dante's mental condition in general, not only his mental attitude regarding the question in hand, and the word '*parola*' of v. 83, repeated in v. 87, seems to mean the words of Beatrice in general and not only the '*detto*' of v. 75.

[2] Cf. Salvadori: *Sulla Vita Giovanile di Dante*, Roma, Soc. Editr. Dante Alighieri, p. 100: 'Questa vana curiosità degli occhi era tutt' uno con l' eccessiva curiosità della mente.'

into the use of allegory, which showed him how little of the truth contained in sacred and profane literature was accessible to the unlearned. It seems likely that he was, at one time, tending toward a belief that truth ('verità'), and consequently access to God, was largely the monopoly of an intellectual aristocracy: an essentially un-Christian doctrine. To study philosophy and become learned is no sin, but to become absorbed in human learning, to the exclusion of all other thoughts, and to prefer it as a means for obtaining truth, to the simpler means devised by God, is a fundamental error[1]. This tendency (which he seems never to have carried to a logical conclusion) was of a kind calculated to promote a worldly attitude of mind, which, in its turn, probably led,—considering the poet's social and political surroundings,—to a practically irreligious life somewhere between 1293 and 1300. The *Convivio,* written years after the crisis of 1300 (when he had turned to grope after the 'diritta via' which had been 'smarrita'), naturally contains no trace of an intellectual ideal that was less than religious[2]. This, however, seems to have been the tendency of which, with its consequences, he repented: the 'via non vera,' for choosing which he is so severely reproved by Beatrice. His having deserted her for another woman was only a concomitant of the whole vicious tendency, decidedly less important. And nevertheless that desertion was so really a part of the intellectual direction he had begun to take soon after her death, that she does not refrain from mentioning it as part of his offence.

I am convinced that in the *Convivio* Dante does not contradict himself, and that he does not contradict what he has already said in the *Vita Nuova.* The information he gives us in his commentary on

[1] Cf. the words of the eagle in *Paradiso* XIX, 64–6 and 82–4: 'Lume non è, se non vien dal sereno Che non si turba mai, anzi è tenebra, Od ombra della carne, o suo veleno.' 'Certo a colui che meco s' assotiglia, Se la scrittura sopra voi non fosse, Da dubitar sarebbe a maraviglia.' Cf. especially the words of Beatrice in *Paradiso* XXIX, 85–93, where she confutes particular errors of philosophers on earth, and then rebukes their general tendency: 'Voi non andate giù per un sentiero Filosofando; tanto vi trasporta L' amor dell' apparenza e il suo pensiero! Ed ancor questo quassù si comporta Con men disdegno, che quando è posposta La divina scrittura, o quando è torta. Non vi si pensa quanto sangue costa Seminarla nel mondo, e quanto piace Chi umilmente con essa s' accosta.' In his examination on Faith (*Par.* XXIV) Dante quotes no philosopher, but only the scriptures, and cf. vv. 89–96: 'Questa cara gioia, Sopra la quale ogni virtù si fonda, Onde ti venne?' Ed io: 'La larga ploia Dello Spirito Santo, ch' è diffusa In su le vecchie e in su le nuove cuoia, È sillogismo che la m' ha conchiusa Acutamente sì, che, inverso d' ella, Ogni dimostrazion mi pare ottusa.' So when he is examined on Hope, (*Par.* XXV): only in regard to Charity (*Par.* XXVI), does he quote Aristotle.

[2] Unless it be the sentence at the end of *Conv.* III 14: 'Onde la nostra buona fede ha sua origine' etc. which seems to ascribe to Philosophy a part more important than that of a mere aid to faith (cf. *Convivio* III, 7 and 8).

Voi che intendendo can be summarized in an inartistic but more obvious form, as follows:

In *Convivio* II, 2 he says to his readers: 'I am now as reverently and affectionately devoted to the memory of Beatrice as I ever was' ('quella Beatrice beata...vive...in terra colla mia anima'), [and he might have added that she was more to him now than she had ever been before]. 'But as many of you know, I wrote the "canzone" *Voi che intendendo*, in praise of that noble lady whom I mentioned at the end of the *Vita Nuova*. That lady whom I had previously rejected, in 1291, appeared to me in August of 1293 with Love as her sponsor for the first time, and appealed to my reason in such a way as to cause me to reconsider my former resistance ('apparve primamente accompagnata d'Amore...e prese alcun luogo nella mia mente'). You will remember that, as I said in the *Vita Nuova*, it was her dignified kindness ('gentilezza') rather than my own choice, that caused me to yield to her, for she seemed so full of pity for my desolate condition that first my eyes and then my heart were so affected that all my sympathies went out to her. But love cannot grow to its full height and perfection in so short a time as the few days after our first meeting, during which I was charmed, but misjudged and refused her. ('Ma perocchè non subitamente nasce amore e fassi grande e viene perfetto ecc.') Time and reflexion are needed, especially when one is full of conflicting thoughts. When I understood that she was truly accompanied by Love, my reason was partly persuaded, but it still withheld its final consent. Before this love could become perfect, a struggle was still required between the thoughts that argued in favour of the lady and my reluctance to take the decisive step. The city was taken, but the citadel still held out ('tenea ancora la rocca della mia mente'; cf. *Convivio* II, 7: 'ancora l' ultima sentenza della mente, lo consentimento cioè, si tenea ecc.'). However, the continual sight of her,—for I continued to see her often,—so caused the memory of my former love to fade, that there could be no doubt as to what the end would be. ('E il soccorso dinanzi ciascuno dì crescea,—che far non potea l' altro.') And so, foreseeing my complete surrender, I sought relief for my emotions in the "canzone" which I am now explaining, and addressed myself to the intelligences of Venus, for I now knew whence came the victory of the new thought which was completely mastering me. ('Dirizzai la voce mia in quella parte onde procedeva la vittoria del nuovo pensiero, che era vittoriosissimo')' In *Convivio* II, 7 and 8, he gives additional explanations, and in II, 9 he says: 'It was only natural that the

intelligences of Venus, who are unable to inspire love in a living being for one that is dead, should transfer this love of mine to a living object.'

In *Convivio* II, 13 he begins to expound the allegory, and so is free to give a still fuller explanation. He says: 'Some time after I had lost the first delight of my soul, I sought comfort in the book of Boethius to whom Philosophy had appeared as a comforter, and in that work of Cicero in which he speaks of the consoling power of Philosophy. I began to imagine her as just such a noble lady as the one I have spoken of already, who appeared to offer me consolation a year after the death of Beatrice. After I had been studying for about thirty months, I became completely absorbed in my love of Philosophy, and it was then that I wrote *Voi che intendendo*, the poem in which I show myself to be on the point of yielding to that lady who is, according to the true, that is the allegorical, sense, Philosophy herself. In this sense, that is the allegorical, I represent myself as turning away from the natural love of woman to a better, higher love. But I could not expect my readers to understand the true meaning of the poem, and when I wrote it I was content that they should understand only the literal meaning, which I have already explained in full. But I repeat that I composed that poem for that lady who is no less than the daughter of God, the queen of everything, most noble and beautiful Philosophy.' And in *Convivio* II, 16 he adds: 'It was right that I should turn from a love that was inferior,—no matter how worthy,—to one that was so far superior as is philosophic love superior to sexual love.'

So far Dante. If I might venture to put into the mouth of the poet not only what he says, but also what he implies by placing the literal and the allegorical interpretations side by side, the one after the other, I should represent him as saying: 'You have read the literal interpretation first, and then the more important allegorical interpretation, and so you will see that the time when, after about thirty months of study, I became enamoured of Philosophy, is the same time when my reason began to approve of the noble lady whom it had formerly despised. The literal explanation by itself will have shown you that my love for her was no ignoble passion, and the allegorical will show you that I did not disloyally abandon Beatrice for her. For my reason would never have consented to that change, had it been a change merely from one woman to another, but since my new mistress was not only a woman but Philosophy herself, and this my second love was

obviously superior to my first sexual love, my reason could not but consent to the change, however reluctantly.'

This is how I, guided by those who have gone before me (and I have not even mentioned some of the greatest—the pioneers), understand Dante's account of his relations with the 'gentile donna.' His explanation is straightforward, he does not disguise the facts, but his argument is specious, and of that, I think, he is already uncomfortably aware. Where, at any rate, is that argument when he stands before Beatrice, 'regalmente proterva'? Does it then occur to him to say: 'That lady was not only a woman but Philosophy to me, and, understood in its true sense, my love for her was philosophic love whence all truth is derived'? No; to the direct question: Guilty or not guilty of preferring the love of a mortal woman to the memory of mine, of preferring human casuistry to truth revealed by God? he answers faintly: 'Sì.'

J. E. Shaw.

Baltimore, Md. U.S.A.

THE 'CANTIGAS DE SANTA MARIA' OF ALFONSO X.

Since the *Cantigas* of King Alfonso the Learned were published in two magnificent volumes by the Spanish Academy in 1889 these poems have received rather less attention than might have been expected. The dulness of the ancient Portuguese *Cancioneiros* may partly account for this neglect. But the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, written in the Galician-Portuguese language, and the Portuguese *Cancioneiros* differ totally in character. From the Portuguese *Cancioneiros* it is not easy to extract a concrete fact—if we except the references in the *cantares d'escarnho*; the poems are entirely subjective. On the other hand there is not a page of the *Cantigas* which does not throw some curious light on the life of the thirteenth, or on the life and rather enigmatic character of King Alfonso. Some of these poems express beautiful and widely-extended legends, that, for instance, of the Jew in England who killed a Christian boy for singing morning, noon and night *Gaude Virgo Maria*, and buried him, and still he sang *Gaude Virgo Maria* (6); or 55 (cf. 94) which tells how the Virgin took the place of the nun, *seruiu pela monia que se fora do moesteyro*; or that of the monk in the garden who heard a *passarinna* singing *en tan bon son* that he remained there 300 years or more in ecstasy (103); that of the pilgrim knight doomed to fill his pitcher with water which always runs out again till he sheds two tears and they fill the pitcher; that of the *moller aleimana* in Apulia who on losing at dice throws a stone at the image of the Virgin and Child: the Virgin raises an arm and wards the stone from the Child (136; in 294 an angel lifts an arm to receive the stone, and the German woman is burnt). But these are comparatively rare, whereas references to the daily life of the people are very numerous. We read of dicers and *ribaldos*; of the *uilão de gran barata* who, going with four others to a fair, has his mouth mysteriously twisted for doubting that an old shoe had been worn by the Virgin (61); the *uella* who is at

least the more immediate ancestor of Trotaconventos and Celestina and of Gil Vicente's Branca Gil and Anna Diaz if the prototype is in the *De Amore* ascribed to 'Pamphilus Maurilianus':

> era moller mui vil
> e d'alcayotaria sabedor e sotil (64);

the man stoned for going to Xerez and Seville *quand' eran dos mouros* (124); merchants of Paris and Flanders buying wool in England (35); the ship with 800 *romeus* bound for Acre (33); the peasants who find and hide and then secretly sell the falcons of the *caçadores* (366); the *trobador* imprisoned by Count Symon in Gascony for his satiric verses (363); the *uilão* of Flanders who on the advice of a witch steals a consecrated wafer to place in one of his hives (128); the heretics of many kinds in Tolosa (208); the German pilgrim who takes three months to go from Tolosa to Santiago and back (175); the fishermen of Faaron [Faro] in Algarve (183); the *jograr* who puts up for the night at the house of a *caualeiro* and is given *panos* (194); the thievish inn-*ospeda* who eats of the cakes made by pilgrims with the flour which they had brought with them (157); the servant (*seruenta*) who steals some of the meat which the pilgrims had sent out to buy on arriving at the inn (159); the priest who runs *como çerua* to spread the news when the deaf man is healed—'hears the cock and the frog' (69); a small boy decoying wayfarers to where brigands await them (102); the *astroso tafur* playing dice outside a church (in Catalonia) (154); the knight who orders *touros* for his wedding (144); the poor woman who brings her one sheep to the *ouelleiro* to keep with his flock (147); the poor woman who keeps hives outside a church (326); the Castilian peasant reaping[1] sickle in hand and on his head a hat of straw to keep off the sun (289); the wrestlers and reciters at an August fair (351); the Salamanca student (*scolar*): *lija en Salamanca* (291)—a hundred vivid touches of everyday life. These references add to the interest of the poems, but it must be confessed that their interest is rather historical than poetic, for the most part. The method of their composition was unlikely to result in master-lyrics. The author tells us plainly over and over again that he took the written legend or miracle and turned it into rhyme—*com' eu achei escrito, com' escrit' achei*, etc.[2] Elsewhere it is *com' aprendi, como contaron a mi, segund' oy*. He speaks of

[1] At Tocha, cabo Madride. The spelling Tocha recalls the proposed derivation of Atocha from Θεοτόκος. In no. 265 Ἅγιος becomes Ayoz.

[2] *Passim*. Cf. 25, 51, 58, 59, 68, 73, 106, 115, 132, 168, 241, 251, 258, 265, 272, 284, 296.

a miracle which was found in a book and taken 'from among three hundred' (33), of a *miragre fremoso*

de que fix'[1] meu cantar (47);

of a miracle 'for which I made music and words (*bon son et cobras*) because I took a fancy to it (188)'; of a miracle '*de que fiz cobras e son*' (64)[2]; of a book full of miracles at Soissons (61); and he tells us that a miracle—before he was concerned with it—was known throughout Spain:

et este miragre
souberon per tod' Espanna (191).

Thus a certain wooden quality in many of these poems is to be explained by the fact that they are translations. He returns to the people[3] in altered form the stories already known and indeed plainly of popular origin. The wings of his poetical flights are waxen and melt in the sun. He can rise to great heights, for instance in the description of the calm after the storm at sea (313) there are verses worthy of the best Spanish *romances*. The storm had been black as pitch and *a nau' era iá quebrada* and they *braadauan et chamauan*, called on God and all the Saints; then the priest sings the *Salve Regina* and the storm ceases:

E o mar tornou mui manso
E a noit' escrareceu.

Or in the extraordinarily vivid 325: a captive woman is rescued by the Virgin from Tangiers and she awakes at dawn near Silves (*foi quando aluzeçia*), and listens to the sounds of awakening life around her. First she hears Moors speak and thinks she is still in Africa; then she hears a group of Christians going to visit their vineyards:

E ascuitou hũa peça
et oỷu falar os mouros
que ỷan cauar as uỷnnas,
d'eles brancos, d'eles louros;
et oỷu mongir as uacas
et oỷu bruỷar os touros,
et diss': en terra de Tanjar
me soon como soya.
A pouco de rato pois este
oỷu gran peça de crischãos
que ỷan ueer sas vỷnnas,
todos as lanças nas mãos....

[1] So j. b. 2. T. j. 1 and the Codex of Toledo read *fiz*.
[2] Cf. 307: e segund' as paraulas lle fez o son
and 293: mui grande milagre onde fiz eu cobras et son.
[3] Of one poem (172) he expressly says:
et d'esto cantar fezemos
que cantassen os iograres.

These and a few similar passages are hard to reconcile with the King's ordinary business-like rather pedestrian style. There is something substantial and materialistic about the majority of his poems: his heart is stirred by the goodly sound of the priests singing in unison:

os crerigos en mui bon son
cantando o *kyrieleison*;

if he is led to contemplate the heavens it is by way of the deep blue of his illuminated manuscripts:

coor mui marauillosa
que ao ceo semella
quand' é con sas splendores;

and he speaks of a scent as 'fairer than lilies or violets *or rose water*' (128).

Words are ruthlessly cut in twain to provide a rhyme, *ser(uo)* thus rhyming with *jazer*, and there is a tendency for the verse to degenerate into a jingle, which is never the case in the musical plaintive songs of Portugal for all their monotony and absence of thought. Here we have none of their softness; the vowel-sounds are far more marked, and if the verse at its best thus has a finer, fuller sound it needs more delicate handling to avoid harshness and stridency. The *Cantigas de Santa Maria* are in a sense nearer the *Cancioneiro de Resende* than to the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana*. But their themes are thoroughly poetical, that is, simple, of the people. King Alfonso styles himself the *trobador*, the *entendedor* of the Virgin:

Ista Dona tenno por Sennor
et de que quero seer trobador,
se eu per ren poss' auer seu amor,
dou ao demo os outros amores (10);

e poren seu entendedor serei (130).

He is her *trobador*, her *loador* (279). He makes the nuns dream (295) that her image, decked out for Easter, wishes to kiss the King's hands. She is *esta santa moller* (it might be his grandson, King Diniz, writing of his wife the *Rainha santa*). She is *mui leal aos seus nas coitas*. She favours King Alfonso, serving him in return for his service. She helps

quen lle cantares
ou prosas faz de loor.

She saves his pet *bestiola* from being trodden underfoot by the horses (354), she discovers for him a great treasure of gold and silver (348). She causes him to reign and gives his enemies *o que mereçiam* (200). So he asks her (401) for Paradise, for strength against the Moors who still have in Spain *gran part' a meu pesar*, and for protection from

disloyal friends: *amig' encuberto.* He for his part sings *ssas graças muy granadas* and exalts her deeds in a rivalry with the miracles of the Old Testament and the New. If Balaam's ass spoke so here does a sheep:

A madre do que a bestia
de Balaam falar fez
ar fez pois hũa ouella
ela falar hũa uez (147).

She increases the store of the widow of Brittany's wine (385) and the flour given in charity (203). She provides King Alfonso with fish to entertain a large company. Here obviously it is King Alfonso who is speaking. But her actions are not always so edifying. She not only protects the contrite nun but *'livrou a abadessa prenne'* (7). She saves the monk drowned in a river on the way to see his *druda* (11) as well as the priest drowned in *Sena, que per Paris uen,* who was no doubt bent on a worthier purpose (111). Her acts are often very homely. She restores his lost falcon to an *ifançon* of Aragon (44), she smooths the course of true love (135), she saves a cargo of wheat and barley (112), she brings in the goats to the convent of Monserrat (52). Here we have evidently the voice not of King Alfonso but of the people, whose very expressions perhaps occur, e.g. *a pistola* (the epistle) (135) or *Aquadalquivir* (143). His satire against priests and doctors is eminently popular. The *meges*[1] do no good to the girl of Cordoba in spite of the 500 *maravedis* they receive from her mother (321), the *celorgião* is equally useless in 157, 'muitos fisicos' *non lle prestaran ren* to the man of Aragon (173). The priests are treated as they are treated by the people throughout the Middle Ages:

en Chartes ou' un clerigon
que era tafur et ladron (24).

In Fita, *logar fort' assaz,* in the realm of Toledo

un crerigo auia
de missa que deuoçon
mostrau' acá aa gente
mais non era assi non.

He steals the silver from the cross in his Church, and as a punishment he loses his sight and his nose begins to broaden and lengthen. Here it is some forerunner of Lazarillo making his observations, and not King Alfonso. So it is the malicious eye of the people which represents the *abades*

tollend' os frocos das testas
et descobrind' as moleiras;

[1] Doctors. It is the Catalan word now in use: *metge.*

or the ex-*abbade* (389) who offers a pair of capons for the recovery of his son and has much pleasure in eating them himself; or the priest whose legs turned knees backwards as a punishment for making himself *panos menores* of an altar cloth (327); or the chaplain who leaves the old woman to die alone in her straw hut and sets off running when he hears that the rich usurer is dying (75). In his references to the Jews, again, he represents popular opinion and does not attempt to guide or repress it. The Christians massacre the Jews in 6, the falseness of the Jews is great (25), an arch falls on some Jews who were mocking *un ome bõo* (286); a Jew is represented as stealing the image of the Virgin, carrying it off under his *capa*; at the request of Merlin the Virgin causes the child of a Jew to be born with its face turned backwards, by which sign he converted many (108). Nor, once more, would the King have taken sides in favour of Villa Sirga in the rivalry between that shrine and Santiago de Compostela apparent in several of the poems: he is merely reproducing the words of some inhabitant of Villa Sirga anxious to divert the traffic of pilgrims from Santiago. And his subjects are mostly of the people. His inclination to write of *os simples, les misérables* would be very remarkable, and a sign that he was a true poet and, moreover, that these were not poems of youth, were it not for the fact that he received his subjects ready-made. Thus we have the boy-shepherd of Soissons, and his mother—

que fiava
a lãa mui volonter
per que ss' ambos governauan (53);

hũa uelloçinna
mui catiua e mui pobre—

living in a straw *choça* (75); the *om' assaz pobre* of Aragon whose plot of vines is saved from the hail though all the surrounding vineyards are ruined (161); a *lavrador debullando seu millo na eira* (22); *hũa mesquinna moller; hũa monia mesquinna*; the poor woman who

atan muit' era pobre
que pidia as rações (304);

the *andaluz* who loves his little son, '*filýnno*,'

com' a uida que uiuia (323);

women gleaning; a peasant keeping cows and in fear of wolves; the *moller mesquýnna* of Santarem, who lives by selling *çeuada* (369); the *catiua* who takes the body of her dead child

con gran quebranto
ao mõesteiro o leuou et ant 'o
altar o pos',

and cries to the Virgin 'give me my child that I was wont to see laugh' (21: an instance of a fine theme almost spoilt by the King's rather grotesque rhymes); the mother of the

boỹnno d'uuns doz' anos[1]

dead of fever and her pathetic farewell:

sen ti, meu fillo
este mundo s'escurece...
sen ti, mui soa
fico, et tu sen mi soo (331).

The authors of an article published in the *Bulletin hispanique* in 1911[2], after a careful examination of the music of the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, came to the following conclusion: 'A notre avis...le grand nom du Roi Savant s'applique aux recueils des Cantigas comme celui d'Homère aux poèmes homériques.' They grant that he composed many, especially in the first hundred, 'mais qu'il en ait été l'unique auteur, cela nous semble aussi difficile à admettre qu'il le serait de lui attribuer la composition des musiques[3] tour à tour érudites et populaires, romaines et visigothiques, provençales et castillanes.'

In some measure this conclusion is borne out by examination of the language of these *cantigas*. Were all these poems written by one person his use of local colour in fact and expression would be amazing. Little stress can be laid on the variations of such a common word as 'shut' (*fechadas, sarradas, chousas*) or of proper names (*Conturbel, Cantoaria, Conturbe* for Canterbury, *Ingraterra, Engraterra, Englaterra* for England, *Seixon* and *Sosonna* for Soissons) especially as the variants *Brieyçon* and *Briançon* (146) and *Joan, Johan, Yoan, Yoanne* (138) occur in one and the same poem. But the language varies slightly according to the origin of the poem. There are a considerable number of French words and expressions. The *se Deus me perdon'*, ubiquitous in the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana*, is here present (though more rarely), with its equivalents *se Deus m'aiude, m'anpar, me parca*; but the expression *par san Dinis* and *Denis* is French and is never used by the Portuguese King Diniz. The quotation given above of the boy-shepherd of Soissons reads more like French than Portuguese; and we have *arento, argen,*

[1] Cf. Callimachus: Δωδεκετῆ τὸν παῖδα πατὴρ ἀπέθηκε Φίλιππος
ἐνθάδε, τὴν πολλὴν ἐλπίδα, Νικοτέλην.

[2] Henri Collet and Luis Villalba, *Contribution à l'étude des 'Cantigas' d'Alphonse le Savant (d'après les codices de l'Escurial)*. (*Bulletin hispanique*, vol. xiii (1911), pp. 270—290.)

[3] That the King insists that the *son* of 347 is *meu ca non allẽo* seems to show that they were not always of his own composition.

and *argente* for 'silver,' *fais* (='do'), *maison* (used also by Berceo who also borrowed from Coincy and other French writers), *bis*, *poçon*; *niente*, the Provençal and Catalan *nient*, occurs in 158, i.e. in a poem dealing with Tolosa and Rocamadour. It is suggested that the thief Elbo of 13 is merely Le Beau. In 82, which tells how the Devil in the form of a black man attacked with pigs a poor monk of Canterbury, a *miragre mui bel*, as the King says, occurs the word *frocaz*. The word 'frock' may have been in the original account of the miracle. In 85, another English miracle, we have the word *esterlĩgs* and the form *temptatiões*, and in 86 which deals with St Michael's Mount (spelt *Migäel*, whereas in 39 it is *Miguel*) in *Bretanna Mayor*, we find the King telling how one could cross from the mainland only at low tide. The word *freame* (*fiambre*) occurs in a Spanish miracle, the word *almograues* in one of Algarve (277); 104 which tells of a woman of Caldas de Rey and her *amigo* is thoroughly Galician in subject, the *crerigo trobador*,

que sas cantigas fazia
d'escarno mais ca d'amor[1],

is of course Portuguese (of Alanquer) (316), and the monk who loved the Virgin but had mad doubts about transubstantiation,

en o Sagramento
dultaua con loucura (149),

was a precursor of Luther, a *preste moogo, en terra d'Aleỳmanna*. But these differences and niceties of language and subject only bring us back to what King Alfonso freely admits, viz. that in many cases he was merely a translator, and show that he followed his originals closely. The miracles, in verse and prose, he collected from all sources and countries to add to his book:

porreỳ-o con os outros
ond' un gran livro é chẽo

(347, where he says *de que fiz cantiga nova*, seeming to imply that the

[1] Like King Alfonso he finally becomes a *trobador* of the Virgin:

Seunor, eu fol
fui de que trobei per outra
dona....
porén te uenno jurar
que en quant' eu uiuo seia
nunca per outra moller
trobe nen cantares faça.

Cf. 363, where the *trobador* is released from prison by the Virgin after promising to *trobar polo seu amor*.

miracle as it came to him was already in verse and that he rewrote it). The miracles were so many that

> se purgamẽo foss' o ceo estrellado
> et o mar todo tinta, que grand' é prouado,
> et uiuesse por senpr' un ome enssinado
> de scriuer,

he would not be able to write down half of them (110).

The King had the local accounts copied for him—Soissons, he himself says, was especially rich in them—his own books, such as the *Speculum historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais (of which he had received a copy from St Louis, King of France), provided him with others. His work lay in selecting and in providing a *son* or metrical dress, sometimes both, for such as pleased him, *porque me d'ele paguei* (188). Or if they were already in metre he would probably alter them so as to conform to his refrain-plan, by which as a rule the last line of each verse rhymes with the last line of the refrain[1]. That he did so touch up and remodel the great majority of these *cantigas* there seems little reason to doubt[2]. That the theme of the majority was not of his invention is certain. A few of the poems which stand out from the rest and show something like inspiration may have come to him from poets of a reputation which forebade remodelling instead of from his ordinary collectors and copyists. It is perhaps significant that in the margin of 223 in Codex j. b 2 is written the name of the Portuguese poet Arias Nunez, doubtless the talented Galician priest Ayras Nunes, author of nearly a score of poems in the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana*. There seems no reason to agree with the authors of the article in the *Bulletin hispanique* that the King's compositions are less numerous after the first hundred poems. The personal allusions perhaps even become more frequent. For instance in 398 the King is building a Church at Santa Maria del Puerto; in 279 he is ill and implores the Virgin for help; 257 is a miracle that happens to him at Seville; 295 refers to his *Cantares* of Santa Maria

[1] Philologists have reason to be thankful for these exigencies of rhyme (twenty or more verses sometimes ending in the same rhyme) which introduce many far-sought words, e.g. *belmez*, *prumaz*.

[2] If it is objected that he uses expressions apparently beneath the dignity of a king, familiarities of style such as *amigos meus*, or says that he has heard a miracle related by

> omees et molleres
> que estauan y (98),

or by

> omees de bõa uida (302),

it is enough—if he is not merely copying the original before him—to recall the fact that in his *Siete Partidas* he decrees that the King's sons must wash their hands before and after a meal and not wipe them on their clothes; that they must not bend over the dish as if they wanted all the food, etc.: the King's dignity was not yet very remote.

and is evidently written by himself; in 379 he speaks of himself with pride as the founder of Santa Maria del Puerto, of the colonists who came thither from Genoa and Chartres, and of the trouble from Catalan corsairs; 376 refers to the affection existing between him and his brother Don Manuel; in 367 the Virgin heals him, King of Castille and of Santiago de Compostela: his legs, he says, were so swollen *que en as osas caber non podian*; 345 again dwells on his *cantigas*: none but himself would have mentioned his reigning and his *trobar* as facts apparently of equal import:

Enton el rei Don Affonso
Fill del rei Don Fernando
Reinaua...
et demais trobando
Andaua dos seus miragres
Grandes que sabe fazer;

in 321 a girl is brought to him to be healed by his touch. He denies having any such power, and tells the *pastorýnna* and her mother that

Ca dizedes que uertude
ei, dizedes neicidade...
Falades muito
et tan toste com' andorýnna,

he adds with a touch all his own: 'you are chattering like a swallow.' Moreover 362 refers to 35, and 366 to 10. The assumption that he wrote chiefly the first hundred *cantigas* was due to the text of the oldest MS, the *codex* of Toledo, which reads

fez cen cantares e sões

and

Pois cẽ cãtares feitos
Acabei et con son.

The later readings *fezo* and *poucos* are attributed to King Alfonso himself; but in any case the fact that he had written a hundred would not prevent him from writing more, and if a hundred are to be singled out as peculiarly his own, it is tempting to compose it of the *cantigas de loor* and of the personal poems. As to the rest he was a zealous and talented translator, like his predecessor in rhyming miracles, Gautier de Coincy (1177–1236), author of the *Miracles de la Sainte Vierge*:

miracles que truis en latin
translater vueil en rime et mettre.

King Alfonso chose the Galician-Portuguese language, following the fashion of the time which considered it a softer, more pliant medium for

lyrical verse; and partly perhaps because he had been brought up in Galicia. His poems probably had considerable influence in Portugal, where his name was held in great respect and his prose works translated. King Diniz is said to have written a book of *cantigas* in honour of the Virgin: it is unlikely that it will be seen again (if indeed it ever existed); but Diniz had certainly read his grandfather's *cantigas*, which he imitates directly more than once.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

THE IRRATIONAL NEGATIVE IN CONCESSIVE SENTENCES. A STUDY IN GERMANIC SYNTAX.

The present investigation[1] was begun with a view to elucidating the use of 'nie sô' in the last line of the following passage from Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*, III, 153, ll. 4 ff.:

> iwer freude es wirt verzert
> noch von sîner hende,
> ern sî nie sô ellende.

The context here requires the rendering: 'Your [Kei's] joy will yet be destroyed by his hand, though he be never so forlorn.' The last few words I have translated thus in order to bring out the exact parallelism between the M.H.G. and the English construction. The use of the negative 'nie' in Modern German would be inadmissible; and Martin in his commentary on *Parzival*[2] translates correctly: 'und mag er noch so heimatfern sein.' On the other hand, B. Schulze shows, in the last paragraph of his article on 'Die negativexcipierenden Sätze[3],' a complete misunderstanding of the passage when he attempts to bring it under the type of clause indicated in his title, and renders it: 'ihr werdet es später büssen, er müsste denn auch später noch so *ellende* sein [dass er euch nicht züchtigen kann],' adding: 'das "nie" passt nur in einem würklichen Bedingungssatz "wenn er einst nicht so ellende ist"; vgl. Bartschs Anm.[4], hier liegt also ein fall vor, wo die würklich conditionale vorstellung völlig die oberhand gewonnen hat. ob das ein *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* ist, müste weitere beobachtung lehren.'

The examples adduced by Martin, *loc. cit.*, show that this passage is not a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, and this article attempts to collect the

[1] This paper was originally planned to be read in the Seminar Class held at University College, London, in 1910, by Professor Priebsch, whose untiring help I here cordially acknowledge.

[2] Vol. II, p. 154.

[3] *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XXXIX, p. 336.

[4] Bartsch regards 153, 6 (1112) as 'eine Vermischung zweier Konstruktionen: *er'n si sô ellende* und *er'n ist nie sô ellende*.' He translates: 'er müsste denn ganz elend sein; er ist aber durchaus nicht so elend.'

evidence for the use of 'nie' (or other negatives) + 'sô' in High and Low German, to point to analogues in other Germanic languages, and finally to explain how the negative came to be applied in such cases. A survey of this kind cannot aspire to be exhaustive, but will have fulfilled its purpose, if it shows, to however small a degree, the value of the comparative method in the treatment of syntactical problems.

It is well to state at the outset that there are many instances of 'nie sô,' etc., in which the negative is logically correct and does not demand any special consideration. What concerns us is the use of 'nie' (under which I include other negatives 'niht,' 'dehein,' etc.) in a sentence whose meaning (though not necessarily form) is concessive and where 'nie sô' indicates the highest degree. The criterion might well be the possibility of rendering the phrase in modern German by the positive 'noch so' or in English by 'ever so' (the usual construction). As, however, it is not always easy to distinguish at first sight the rational and irrational uses, a few examples are here taken at random from the religious poetry of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. *Die Hochzeit* (ed. Karajan), p. 25, l. 19: 'si was geberht unde lieht, man gesach nie sô hêrlîches niht'; or *ibid.* p. 29, l. 6: 'sô [i.e. like the jewel] ne liuhte nie sô schône der sunne noch der mâne, noch der sternen dehein nie sô rehte enschein'; or again in the *Vorauer Sündenklage* (in Diemer, *Loblied auf Maria*, p. 311, ll. 5 ff.): 'Maria, diu ne wære nie sô manich jâr in der wůsten gewesen...âne dîne gůte,' and *ibid.* p. 308, l. 5.

In all these cases the use of 'nie' is perfectly straightforward[1] and is temporal. It is quite otherwise with another passage from the *Vorauer Sündenklage* (Diemer, p. 299, ll. 7 f.): 'nun ist mîner sunden nie sô vil, sîner gůte ne sî mêre,' for here we feel the concessive force of l. 7 (though grammatically it is the principal sentence), and should naturally translate: 'though my sins be [n]ever so great, His goodness is greater still.' But even here the negative 'nie' cannot be described as irrational, for it is cancelled by the negative 'ne' in l. 8, with the result that the whole passage assumes a positive sense. At the same time it will be well to consider fully such cases, as their concessive character shows them to be closely connected with the type represented by the verses from *Parzival* quoted above, where the concessive clause is subordinate and the use of the negative irrational. This last type may indeed be regarded as the culminating point in the development.

[1] Cf. further *Parzival*, 36, 19 and several instances in the note on pp. 476 f. of Pfannmüller's edition of *Die Heidin* (*Palaestra*, CVIII).

Following out the distinctions just drawn we might set up the following classification of the uses of the concessive 'nie sô' in older High and Low German.

In type A 'nie sô' stands in the principal sentence with verb in the indicative and is followed by a clause subordinate in sense, but not introduced by any conjunction (parataxis). Subdivisions according to the construction of the following clause (Nachsatz) are: A^1, verb in the negative [en-] and subjunctive; A^2, verb in the negative [en-] and indicative; A^3, verb in the positive and subjunctive; A^4, verb positive and indicative.

Type B is similar to type A except that the 'Nachsatz' is here introduced by a subordinating conjunction [daz]. Subdivisions B^1, B^2, B^3, B^4 may be formed on the model of A^1, A^2, A^3, A^4.

Whereas in types A and B 'nie sô' occurs in the principal sentence, in types C and D it is in the subordinate clause.

In type C the dependent clause containing 'nie sô' *follows* the principal sentence and may be classified: in C^1 'nie sô' clause has the verb in the indic. with 'en-'; in C^2 'nie sô' clause has the verb in the subj. with 'en-'; in C^3 'nie sô' clause has the verb in the indic. without 'en-'; in C^4 'nie so' clause has the verb in the subj. without 'en-.'

In type D the dependent clause containing 'nie sô' *precedes* the principal sentence and its subordination is shown by the verb being in the subjunctive (with 'en-' D^1, without 'en-' D^2).

In addition to these there is a type, in which the principal sentence containing 'nie sô' or its equivalent is followed by a relative clause, e.g. Otfried, I, 11, 48: 'noh man [*sc.* nist] io sô gimuati, ther erzelle ira guatî' or *Memento mori* (Müllenhoff and Scherer, *Denkmäler*, XXX *b*), Str. 13, ll. 1 f.: 'nechein man ter [ne] ist sô wîse, ter sîna vart wizze.' As these passages cannot fairly be regarded as concessive, they need not detain us longer. There is, however, one phenomenon which claims our attention before we set forth the examples historically. It consists in the insertion of a condition which qualifies the connection between the 'nie sô' clause and its complementary sentence (it being immaterial whether the sentence-complex is of types A, B, C or D). A good instance is to be found in *Peter von Staufenberg* (ed. E. Schröder), ll. 84 ff.:

> uns seit die aventüre alsô
> daz er nie sô zornic wart,
> seh er ein schoene frouwe zart,
> im verswünd sîn ungemach.

Now the normal concessive connection implies the realization of a fact (expressed in the logically principal sentence) *in spite of* the presence of some real or suppositional opposing elements (in the logically subordinate clause). This holds good also when the concessive clause is one of degree, e.g. 'though he was ever so angry.' In the M.H.G. example just quoted, however, the connection of ideas is rather more complicated. A certain fact (the passing of displeasure, l. 87) is to be realized in spite of another fact (the degree of his anger, l. 85), but on condition that yet another fact (the sight of a beautiful lady, l. 86) be carried into effect. Strange to say, this construction seems to be prevalent at quite an early period.

Our oldest instances of 'nie sô' (concessive) are to be found in Old Saxon. Prof. Priebsch drew my attention to a passage in the *Heliand*, 2272*b*—2277*b* (ed. Sievers):

nio thie man sô hardo ni uuas
gisêrid miđ suhtiun, thoh ina Satanases
fêknea iungron fiundes craftu
habdin undar handun endi is hugi scefti,
giuuit, auuerđit that hie uuôdiandi
fuori undar them folce ; thoh ina simbla ferah fargaf
hêlandeo Crist.

From the purely logical point of view 'thoh ina simbla...Crist' is the principal sentence; grammatically it is the 'Nachsatz,' as the adverb 'thoh' indicates, to the concessive clause beginning with 'thoh' in 2273 *b*. Logically again the concession which *primarily* influences the fulfilment of the thought expressed by 2277 *b* ('simbla ferah forgaf hêlandeo Crist') is the grammatically principal sentence ('Vordersatz'): 'nio thie man sô hardo ni uuas gisêrid...' and the concessive clause beginning 'thoh ina Satanases fêknea...habdin...' is secondary and analogous to the 'inserted conditions' referred to in the paragraph before. Piper realises the concessive sense of the first line of the passage, for he translates in his note: 'nie war ein Mann so schwer geschädigt d. h. mochte einer auch noch so schwer (von Krankheiten) geschädigt sein.' The complex might be classed A^4 + inserted secondary concession.

Still more remarkable is a passage in the Old Saxon *Genesis*, ll. 301 ff. (ed. Piper), for here the 'nie sô' clause occurs in an indirect command dependent on the principal verb 'hietun' and its verb is in the pret. subj.

Hietun, that sia io ni gihôrdin sulic gehlunn mikil,
brakon, an them burugium, that sia io under bak sâuuen...

which passage Piper has construed: 'sie befahlen, dass sie, wenn sie auch noch so grosses Getöse, Gekrach in der Stadt hörten, dass sie doch nicht zurücksehen sollten.' Holthausen has also rendered the 'io ni... sulic' phrase by 'noch so' (*Altsächsisches Elementarbuch*, p. 238, note to 234, 18 f.) and cf. Kögel, *Die altsächsische Genesis*, p. 8.

In O.H.G. I have not been able to discover any instances earlier than Otfried, who affords several. The first occurs in Bk I, 11, 10 and is quoted in Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, s.v. 'so' II, A, 1, ε in vol. X, p. 1351:

ni sî man nihein sô veigi, ni sînan zins eigi.

The pres. subj. 'sî' is due to indirect statement. The context shows that the first half-line is concessive and that it combines with the negative clause of the second half-line to form a complex of type A^1. Another example is to be found II, 11, 12:

[er] ziuuarf allaz thaz girusti, ni uuas iz io so festi,

i.e. type C^1, and yet another V, 19, 59 f.:

ni uuari thu io so richi, ubar woroltrichi,
thoh thu es thar biginnes; ther scaz ist sines sindes.

Erdmann translates in his note, p. 476: 'du warst nie so reich und mächtig in der Welt (d. h. reich und mächtig genug, um dich loszukaufen, 57 f.), wenn du es auch dort versuchen wolltest...der Schatz (wie gross er auch auf der Erde war) ist fort.' The parenthesis inserted after 'Schatz' shows that the concessive nature of l. 59*a* did not entirely escape his notice. Kelle saw this more clearly; cf. his verse translation (Prag, 1870), p. 437, ll. 117 ff.: 'denn wärest du... gewesen einst auch noch so reich.' The type is here A^4 and of special interest is the intercalation of the concessive 'thoh' clause in l. 60*a*.

Apart from Otfried, I have not come across any instances in O.H.G. The 'nîo sô guotes neinbeiz' of Notker, *Mart. Cap.* 810, 11, is not concessive. On the other hand, the religious poetry of the transition period (1050 onwards) teems with them. In *Memento mori* (Müllenhoff and Scherer, *Denkmäler*, XXX *b*) there are, for example, no less than four cases:

str. I, ll. 5 ff.

si [i.e. tisa brôdemi] ne dunchet iuh nie sô minnesam,
eina churza wîla sund ir si hân:
ir ne lebint nie sô [gerno] manegiu zît,
ir muozent verwandelon disen lîb (both A^4).

str. II, ll. 5 f.

si [i.e. tisa wêncheit] ne dûhta sie nie sô minnesam,
si habent si ie doch verlâzen (A^4).

str. XIII, ll. 6 f.

> nechein man ist sô hêre, er ne muoze
> ersterbin (A[1]).

In *Merigarto* (*ibid.* XXXII), p. 98, ll. 71 ff., we have a remarkable case of 'Einschachtelung.' Here the 'nie sô' clause is separated from its complement by two inserted clauses, one conditional, the other disjunctive:

> ouh sagant maniga, ein wazzer sî in Campania,
> daz nieman sî sô umbâra, gitrinchet er dâra,
> iz sî wîb odo man, si megin sâ chindan (A[3]).

The examples which follow are taken from J. Diemer, *Deutsche Gedichte des* 11. *und* 12. *Jahrhunderts*:

Beschreibung des himmlischen Jerusalems, p. 366, ll. 10 ff.:

> sô ist der IIII stain sus
> gehaizen Smaragdus
> in der werelte ist neihit so grûne
> er beneme ime sîne scône (A[3]).

Die Wahrheit, p. 86, ll. 26 ff.:

> er [i.e. der wald] ne ist idoch nie sô lanch noch sô grôz
> er mûze zi jungeste sîner tolden werden blôz (A[3]);

and p. 89, ll. 8 ff.:

> diu bûch sagent uns fur wâr,
> daz niemens sunde sîn sô swære,
> wil er sich lâzen riwen...
> got der ist so genedich,... (A[4]).

Vorauer Sündenklage (Diemer, *Loblied auf Maria*), p. 299, ll. 7 f.:

> nun ist mîner sunden nie sô vil,
> sîner gûte ne sî mêre (A[1]).

The next few cases are cited from Karajan, *Deutsche Sprachdenkmale des* 12. *Jahrhunderts* (Vienna, 1846):

Vom Rechte, p. 4, ll. 19 f.:

> nieman ist sô rîche,
> er muozze den rîchtuom verlân (A[3]);

p. 5, ll. 21 f.:

> sô ist dehein buch sô veste geworht...
> si ne werde zerstôrot (A[1]);

p. 8, ll. 12 ff.:

> die schalche und die diuwe,
> minnent si die triuwe,
> ir armuot sint nie sô grôz,
> die werdent der hêristen genôz (A[4], note the prefixed condition).

Die Hochzeit, p. 19, ll. 9 ff.:

d[iu ist] nie sô here noch sô riche, si treit... (A⁴);

p. 28, ll. 2 ff.:

dehein herre ist so riche,
er beschîne den armen alsô minnechlîchen (A³);

p. 35, ll. 15 ff.:

diu vrouwe ist nie sô h[er]e;
si enfurhte ir dâ vil sêre,
der hêrre ist n[ie] sô rîch[e],
er ne furhte im vraislîchen (both A¹).

There are two cases in the *Hamburger jüngste Gericht* (ed. Hoffmann, *Fundgruben*, II), p. 136, ll. 14 f.:

ez in ist nit so hele,
ez in werde wol uffinbere (A¹),

and p. 138, ll. 8 f.:

der frunt in si da ni so gut,
in dunkeit selbe wenic gnoc (D²).

In the *Wiener Genesis* (ed. J. Diemer, Vienna, 1862), vol. I, p. 4, ll. 5 ff., is a passage containing no less than five instances within the space of nine lines! It is here quoted in part only:

ez [i.e. daz mêr] ne sî ninder so tief daz in darinne si liep ez ne ile dar (A¹).
Dehein lewe si so her...nimmir werde ez so wilde...[iz ne sî ime untertan] (A¹).
Der vogil envliege nie so balde...er ne chome im vil schiere (A¹).
Nehein wrm si so vreissam, erne si im gehorsam (A¹).

Next come several cases quoted by Benecke-Müller, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. 'nie,' vol. II, p. 745, from the *Kaiserchronik* and *Rolandslied*.

Kaiserchr. (ed. *Mon. Germ., Deut. Chron.* I, 1), ll. 5913 f. (B.-M. 35ᵃ):

du nebist nie sô rîche,
du nesterbest alsô wêrliche (A¹)

(quoted by Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik*, III, p. 140);
l. 11649 (B. M. 70ᶜ):

dir newirt nie sô gâhe,
du ne muozest mînes...hêrren...bîten (A¹).

MS. 4 reads 'ne si' in l. 11649 and 'dû mûst' in 11650 (D¹), cf. Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik*, *l.c.*

Rolandslied (ed. Bartsch), ll. 3876 f.:

there heithenen nist nie sô vile,
iz ne sî ir aller veictage (A¹);

ll. 7309 f.:

Karl ther nist nie so rîche,
er ne muoze ime entwîchen (A¹).

Bartsch translates concessively: 'Wie mächtig Karl auch ist,....'

We now pass on to didactic poetry. In the *Welschen Gast* (ed. H. Rückert, *Bibl. der gesammten deutschen nationalen Lit.*, XXX), we find: ll. 1640 ff.:

spricht man von mir boeslîch,
ezn wart nie dehein liet sô lanc,
ezn würde vür brâht mit gesanc (A[1]).

Freidank's *Bescheidenheit* (ed. Bezzenberger), numbered according to Grimm's edition, shows:
99, 17 ff.:

minne nieman pflegen mac
sô tougen einen halben tac,
ezn wizzen viere oder mê (A[1]);

145, 11 f.:

sô stolzen muot nie man getruoc,
ern hete an einem wîbe genuoc (A[1]).

Der deutsche Cato (ed. F. Zarncke, Leipzig, 1852), has in ll. 553 f.:

ez ist nieman sô swach,
in müeje doch sîn ungemach (A[3])

[in l. 554 a Wolfenbüttel MS., written 1464–1470, has 'mut' (A[4])].

Boner's *Edelstein* (ed. F. Pfeiffer, *Dichtungen des deutschen Mittelalters*, IV):
49, 155:

nie wart sô klein gespunnen,
ez kaem etswenn ze sunnen.

We might add here two very late examples, viz. from the satirists of the sixteenth century. They are S. Brant, *Narrenschiff* (ed. D.N.L. XVI), p. 131, no. [50], ll. 29 f.:

Keyn zitlich wollust würt so sůffz,
do von nit gall zů letst ufz flyefz (A[1]);

and G. Fischart, *Geschichtklitterung* (ed. Alsleben, Halle, 1891):
p. 9:

die Sonn kont nicht auff sein so frů[e]
so sah sie jn schon truncken,
der mon kont so spat kommen nie
so sah er jn schon duncken (both A[4]).

Here, too, might be grouped several passages from the religious and didactic poetry of Low German:

Meister Stephans Schachbuch (ed. W. Schlüter), ll. 254 ff.:

were uw de doghet nicht so verne,
wille gy hebben koninges ere,
so weset ten ersten iuwes sulves here (D[2]).

A *Katharinenlegende* in Brussels (ed. W. E. Collinson, Heidelberg, 1915), ll. 1287 ff.:

neman is de des ghetruwe,
dat he eyne borch so vaste buwe
und nummer so vaste mure,
dat se ewichliken dure...

which is of a different type from any of the preceding, but is quoted on account of the irrational negative in l. 1289.
ll. 1351 f.:

dyt en sprek he nu so vro,
he envore weder tho hymmele tho (A[1]).

Lastly we might conveniently introduce at this stage a few instances from M. H.G. prose writers. K. Stolze discusses the construction in his dissertation *Der zusammengesetzte Satz im Ackermann aus Böhmen* (Bonn, 1888), in the chapter on 'Consecutivsätze,' p. 81, and cites from his author: 31, 15 (ed. J. Knieschek):

alle welt klagt, das nie so boser man wurde, er wer an etwas gut (A[3]),

and 36, 19:

so schones mensche gesahestu nie, hettestu eines lintzen augen..., dir wurd darüber grauwen (A[2]).

Similarly we find in the chapter on 'Consecutivsätze' in Röttecken, *Der zusammengesetzte Satz bei Berthold von Regensburg* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, LIII), an instance from Berthold, II, 102, 15:

wan es gewan nie muoter als liebez kint, daz sie sich dés tages über ez erbarme.

Still later we find in the *Theologia Deutsch* (ed. H. Mandel, Leipzig, 1908), on p. 20, ll. 10 f.:

Es ward nie außgang ßo gut ynne bleiben [das Drinbleiben] wer peßer.

The literature of the Spielmann also contains some noteworthy instances. Thus in the beast-epic we find in *Reinhart Fuchs* (ed. K. Reissenberger, *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, no. VII, 2te. Auflage, Halle, 1908):
ll. 118 ff.:

ern gesaz sus hôhe nie alsô,
gesæhe er den vater mîn,
ern vlüge ze im... (A[1] with inserted cond.),

and another passage in the Flemish *Van den vos Reynaerde* (ed. H. Degering, 1910):
ll. 126 ff.:

hi ne hefft niemene so lief,
no den coninc, minen here,
hi ne wilde dat hi lyf ende ere
verlore, mochte hire an winnen... (A[1]).

From the later epics I will content myself with adducing several cases supplied me by Prof. Priebsch from the text of *Johann ûz dem virgiere* (unpublished):

ll. 833 f.:

ich gesach nye mit augen so grosz,
ich getruwete an kamphe syn genosz (A³);

ll. 838 f.:

helm, schilt kan man nit so feste gewysen,
er slage yn mit fusten zu stucken (A³);

ll. 1679 ff.:

ez ist hye nyeman also gůt,
der mir die porten uff důt,
ez wyrt an yme gerochen sere (A⁴).

Note here the inserted relative clause equivalent to a condition; and one from the *Münchener Oswald* (ed. Bäsecke, *Germanische Abhandlungen*, XXVIII):

817:

ez wart kein kristen nie sô guot,
wanne in hungert, er sî ungemuot (A³ + cond.).

Among the court-poets the construction appears to be more prevalent in the epic than in the lyrical poetry. The majority of the cases are taken from Hartmann's *Iwein*:

ll. 684 f.:

mirne wart dâ vor nie sô wê,
desn wære nû al vergezzen (A¹);

ll. 1631 ff.:

ez nist nie sô unmügelich,
bestêt si si alsô mich
...si müeze ir zorn allen lân;

ll. 2947 ff.:

ichn wart nie manne sô holt,
dem ich ditz selbe golt
wolde lîhen oder geben (A² or A³).

ll. 6420 ff.:

diu rede ist nie sô angestlich,
und wil mir got gnædec wesen,
sô trûwe ich harte wol genesen (A⁴);

ll. 8083 f.:

mirne getet daz weter nie sô wê
ichn woldez han geliten ê.

Lachmann comments on 'nie sô' in his note to *Iwein*, l. 2476, quoting several instances (including l. 1631 and l. 6420 above).

A use of 'nie sô' in a particular connection might be mentioned here owing to its relatively frequent occurrence in the court-epic. It is the combination of 'nie sô schiere' in a principal sentence, followed by

a subordinate clause with the conjunction 'sô' or 'ê,' and corresponds to a Modern German 'kaum...als,' e.g. *Erech*, ll. 2579 f.:

daz tet er nie sô schiere,
ê er die sîne zuo sach varn,

cf. *Erech*, ll. 2549 f. In Gottfried's *Tristan* 'nie sô balde' and 'nie sô schiere' are found in the same sense as in the *Erech*-passages, but the 'Nachsatz' is either simply co-ordinated without any conjunction or the verb of this clause is in the subjunctive and has 'en-' prefixed, cf. *Tristan* (ed. Bech), ll. 5465, 13260 (and footnote), 17631 (do.), 18249 (do.). Gottfried also affords a good case of type A^4 in ll. 9012 f.:

doch enwas ez nie sô swære:
Tristan ruort' aber den trachen an (Bech's punctuation).

Another example may be quoted from the Pleier's *Garel* (ed. M. Walz, 1892), ll. 11910 ff.:

nieman ist so sêre wunt,
swenne man die salben strîchet dran,
er werde ein wol gesunter man (A^3).

Passages from other 'Epigonen' are to be found in the note to l. 1605 of Pfannmüller's edition of *Die Heidin* (*Palaestra*, CVIII, pp. 476 f.);

Wilhelm von Österreich, ll. 11210 ff.:

iur vart ist nie sô wilde,
ich enleistes mit iu gern (A^1).

Reinfried von Braunschweig (Stuttgarter Lit. Verein, CIX, ed. K. Bartsch) l. 25814:

doch was er nie so kleine,
daz in kein pfärît möhte tragen (B^3).

Seifried-Helbling (ed. J. Seemüller), I, 429:

frou, ich was nie sô siech,
ich viselet iu ein ohsendiech... (A^3);

and a final example may be taken from *Reinold von Montalban* (Stuttgart. Lit. Verein, CLXXIV, ed. Pfaff), l. 1396:

ir ensint nit so kone,
kommet uwer hant an mynen bart,
ich sprech, daz enkeme (A^3 with cond.).

In the 'Volksepos' the construction is commonest in *Kudrun* (ed. Martin), e.g. 229, 4:

er ist nie sô vrevele, im kome sîn grimmer muot vil schedelîche

(Martin translates 'nie sô' in his footnote by 'noch so' and refers to Lachmann's comments on *Iwein*, 2476; K. Bartsch quotes 229, 1–3, another case of 'nie sô' sentence + Nachsatz of type A^1 with an inserted condition, but he gives a literal translation 'nie so...dass nicht'); 248, 3:

...er dunket sich nie sô vermezzen,
ob er uns wænet twingen, so muoz er sîner hôchvart gar vergezzen
(A^4 with cond.);

344, 2:

wan bi schœnen vrouwen sô sanfte ich nie gesaz,
ich entæte einez lîhte... (A^1).

In the *Nibelungenlied* (ed. Bartsch) is found in 49, 3:

nie keiser wart so riche, der wolde haben wîp,
im zæme wol... (A^3 with rel. clause equivalent to a cond.);

and in *Wolfdietrich* A (ed. Amelung and Jänicke), 510, 3:

do sprach aber der ander: 'er dunket sich nie sô starc,
er muoz mir in der wilde lâzen hie sîn marc' (A^4).

Among the Minnesänger may be noted two cases, viz.: *Spervogel* (*Minnesangs Frühling*), 20, 26:

kein ungelücke wart nie sô grôz, da enwære bî
ein heil... (A^1)

and *Ulrich von Guotenburc* (*Minnesangs Frühling*), 70, 5:

ich sî ir nie sô frömde man,
ich erdringe ir mêre lônes an (D^1).

From the above it is clear that forms of the 'nie sô' construction are frequent in both High and Low German from the earliest times down to the close of the Middle Ages. We have traced them as far as Fischart, and further investigation might well afford us a yet later *terminus ad quem*. A vestige still remains in fact in the old proverb, 'Es ist nichts so fein gesponnen, es kommt endlich an die Sonnen,' or again in the familiar dialogue of Goethe's *Die Mitschuldigen*, Act I, sc. II: 'im Haus ist nichts so schlimm, die Zeitung macht es gut.' But the use of 'nie' before the concessive 'so,' and especially the hypotactic occurrence of 'nie so' (which, indeed, was never so common in German as in English, cf. *infra*), have not prevailed, and a substitute has been found in the positive 'noch so.' It would be a profitable task to map out the development of this latter mode of expression which proved the stronger competitor, but a few early instances must suffice. To those supplied in Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, s.v. 'noch,' II, 13, from *Fastnachtspiele*, 37, 3; Scheidt, *Grobian*, vorr. 15; and in the sense of 'quantumvis'

from Butschky, *Patm.* 9, and Günther, 445, I should like to add an early High German quotation from the *Alsfelder Passionsspiel* (ed. C. W. M. Grein, Cassel, 1874):

ll. 5208 f.:

> werestu nach so groisz,
> ich wil der geben ein smelichen stoisz;

two from the Low German version of *Meister Stephans Schachbuch*, ll. 4972 f.:

> allen werestu noch ens so swinde,
> ik hope doch dat ik mer oghen vinde;

and ll. 5403 f.:

> allen were se noch enes so vorbolghen,
> en man schal...

and further, one from *Valentin und Namelos* (ed. Seelmann), ll. 279 f.:

> ik sal proven de warheit,
> were de vrowe noch so gemeit;

and one from Flemish, viz. *Willems Reinaert* (ed. E. Martin, Paderborn, 1874):

ll. 1336 f.:

> al ware mijn oom noch also quaet,
> sal men vri recht voort draghen;

where Martin translates 'noch also quaet' as 'noch einmal so schlimm, doppelt so schlimm.' Kehrein quotes in his *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik*, vol. III, § 498, a passage containing a concessive 'noch so' from the theologian Joh. Arndt's *Von wahrem Christentumb*, Magdeburg, 1610, p. 270, and an 'auch so' from 2 *Kön.* 18, 13. By the beginning of the eighteenth century 'noch so' appears to have completely superseded 'nie so,' for we find numerous examples in the *Teutsch-Englisches Lexicon*, published by Thomas Fritschen at Leipzig, 1716, s.v. 'noch,' col. 1333, and all are rendered by an English 'never so[1].'

As to the original significance of 'noch' in the phrase I cannot, from the evidence forthcoming, pronounce a definite opinion. In the Low German quotations is found the fuller word-group 'noch en(e)s so' (='noch einmal so'), but it would seem that 'noch so' alone was early used in this pregnant sense, which might hence be regarded as the starting-point in the line of development of the modern German construction.

From the relatively few monographs and dictionaries of modern German dialects accessible to me just now, I have failed to elicit a single case of 'nie sô.' On the other hand we meet with 'noch so' in

[1] Cf. also W. Sewel, *English and Dutch Dictionary* (Amsterdam, 1716), s.v. 'nog zoo.'

the Altenburg dialect, cf. O. Weise, *Syntax der Altenburger Mundart*, p. 140; in Cologne as 'noch esu' (concessive ?), cf. Hoenig's Dictionary; in the Rappenau in such phrases as 'wan ər aa noχ sou šlau iš,' cf. O. Meisinger, *Wörterbuch der Rappenauer Mundart*, p. 156, col. 2; in Swiss, cf. Staub-Tobler, *Schweizerisches Idiotikon*, vol. IV, p. 641, s.v. 'noch'; and apparently in Alsatian, cf. Martin-Lienhart's Dictionary. We find 'auch' in the same connection in the Transylvanian German dialect, cf. A. Schullerus, *Siebenbürgisch-sächsisches Wörterbuch*, Lieferung 2, p. 220, col. 2: 'mêr wôr e uch krąnk, geng e doch än 'd Amt.'

After this digression we now turn to 'nie sô' and its analogues in the cognate languages of the Germanic family. The Mnl. passages cited *passim* evince the same characteristics as the High German, except that none of them shows the combination 'nooit zoo.' There is, however, a very peculiar irrational use of 'nooit, nie,' etc. for a positive 'ooit' after comparatives[1] and superlatives and in rhetorical questions, cf. Van Helten, *Tijdschrift*, v, 235 ff., and especially F. A. Stoett, *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst* (Syntaxis), The Hague, 1909, but this usage cannot be regarded as parallel in any way to the one we are treating. A much more striking resemblance is seen in the Dutch sentence: 'sy en was soo blint niet oft sy ensach die beurse wel,' discussed in detail by Van Helten, *Vondels Taal*, p. 160 f. with special reference to the use of 'oft,' which he compares with High German 'oder,' quoting in illustration 'der ast ist nicht so hoch oder ich kann dabei.' This latter sentence is given as a rendering of the modern Dutch 'die tak is niet zoo hoog, of ik kan er bij.' The normal construction in such concessive clauses of degree is, however, a word-group containing 'nog zoo' as in N.H.G., cf. *Woordenboek der ned. Taal*, col. 2048, s.v. 'nog.'

Next may fitly come an instance drawn from the old Frisian, viz., from the Hunsigoer text given in K. von Richthofen's *Friesische Rechtsquellen*, Berlin, 1840, p. 30, l. 4: '...thet thi mon nede (= ne hede) na sa ewele due (hsl. den), hi ne muge tha sende...' (A^1).

I have not been able to parallel the construction in Old Icelandic, but it is still extant in Modern Danish and Swedish, where 'aldrig saa' (Swed. så) actually occurs in the subordinate concessive clause. Cf. Wenström-Harlock, *Svensk-Engelsk Ordbok* (Stockholm, 1904), s.v. 'aldrig,' and Larsen's *Dano-Norwegian and English Dictionary*. We may note the Swedish: 'om ni gåfve mig aldrig så mycket' (subordinate) and 'de må vara aldrig så fattiga' (paratactic). Swedish uses 'aldrig'

[1] Cf., for Icelandic, Cleasby-Vigfússon, *Icelandic-English Dictionary*, s.v. 'aldri.'

in concessive clauses even without 'så,' e.g., 'om det vore aldrig den' (='whoever it might be'). In Danish the positive construction 'nok saa' also occurs. A thorough investigation of the history of this phenomenon in the Scandinavian languages might be expected to throw considerable light on some of the problems involved.

In English the 'never so' construction has been in vogue from the earliest times apparently and is still living, though it tends to be banished more and more from everyday speech and to be considered archaic or at any rate literary. Mätzner devotes much space to it in his *Englische Grammatik*, III, pp. 139 f. (2nd ed. Berlin, 1875). Starting from the O.E. example: 'nân man ne dorste slean ôðerne man, næfde he næfre swâ mycel yfel gedôn...' (*Saxon Chronicle*, 1087), he quotes a large number of passages from Middle English (which may be supplemented by reference to *N.E.D.*, s.v. 'never') down to Fielding and Bentley. He also gives us a few instances of the affirmative 'ever so' from Butler, Rowe, Fielding and Pope, some of them antedating the earliest quotation, s.v. 'ever' in the *N.E.D.*, viz. Locke. The syntactical explanation he offers of 'never so' is mentioned below. His comparison of it with two types of the Middle High German construction (as exemplified in the *Kaiserchronik*, 70°) seems to be the only attempt to utilise both languages for the treatment of the question prior to the present investigation. There are some useful comments on Shakespeare's employment of 'never so' in W. Franz, *Shakespeare-Grammatik* (2nd ed., 1909), § 408, and some further instances from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the same author's article, *Zur Syntax des älteren Neuenglisch* in *Englische Studien*, XVIII, p. 218. I should just like to add that the competition between 'never so' and 'ever so' was at its fiercest in the eighteenth century. It is evident from Addison's defence of 'never so' (*Spectator*, no. 590), that the logically-minded had already begun to criticise the usage. Addison says the sentence 'be the distance never so remote' is elliptical inasmuch as it stands for 'be the distance not [near, but] ever so remote.' Dr Johnson writing in 1755 feels that 'never so' contains a 'harsh and unprecedented ellipsis' (e.g., 'as never was any') and that propriety requires 'ever so,' though he admits the former to be 'a form of speech handed down by the best writers, but lately accused, I think with justice, of solecism.' Worcester quotes a remark by Smart (1837): '"Charm he never so wisely," i.e. "Charm he *not* [merely wisely, but] ever so wisely," a genuine English mode of expression, though the squeamishness of grammaticasters has rendered it obsolete.' In the Modern English

dialects 'ever so' alone seems to be the form in use especially in the phrase 'not if it were ever so,' cf. *English Dialect Dictionary*, s.v. 'ever so' b.

Outside the Germanic languages no parallels have come to light, though irrational negatives are known in both Greek and Latin in other connections. There is, strange to say, an irrational 'never so' in certain Modern Romance languages, but not in concessive clauses of degree. In the *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen* of Diez, in Part III, p. 429, are to be found the questions 'quien vió *nunca tal* mal ?' and Portuguese 'quem vio *nunca tal* cousa ?' Reference to this is made in Van Helten's article on the Middle Dutch 'nooit zoo' = 'nie so' in analogous cases (cf. *supra*).

It now remains to take stock of the heterogeneous material collected and to see if it is capable of supplying any explanation for the use of an illogical negative to express the highest degree of a concession. In the earliest examples type A is the most frequently represented, 'nie sô' standing as the head-clause whether as a principal sentence or in indirect speech. Of the subdivisions of A the first [A^1] show the most logical form of expression, e.g. 'diu vrouwe ist nie so here, si enfurhte...' for the clause beginning 'si enfurhte' is simply a negatived consecutive clause from the logical point of view, though there is no grammatical conjunction of consequence as there is, e.g. in Lamprecht von Regensburg, *Diu tohter von Syon* (ed. Weinhold), ll. 3718 f.:

> nie wîp wart sô guot noch man,
> daz er alle zît daran
> treffe, des er wil râmen (B^3).

Of A^2 there is no certain example in the material collected, though the 'Nachsatz' in it is simply a negatived consecutive proposition with the verb in the indicative. The omission of the particle 'en-' in A^3 and A^4, and in particular the use of the indicative in A^4, already contain the elements of irrationality. The former phenomenon is analogous to the disappearance of 'en-' in the exceptive phrase 'es sei (denn),' while the latter can perhaps best be explained by the ellipsis of a connecting idea, subconsciously present in the mind of the speaker. The example of A^4 drawn from the poem *Vom Rechte*: 'ir armuot sint nie sô grôz, die werdent der hêristen genôz' would, literally translated, run 'their poverty is never so great, they shall become the companions of the noblest.' In it the suppressed connection appears to be: 'their poverty is never so great [that they shall not become companions, etc., therefore] they shall become....' That the representation of the highest degree is frequently accompanied by a negative association, is evident from the

use of 'un-' in Modern German in 'Unmenge,' 'Unmasse,' 'Unsumme[1].' But still the larger problem remains as to how the negative could establish itself in the grammatically subordinate clause (cf. English, Scandinavian and types D in M.H.G.). In M.H.G. the concessive clause was normally introduced by the conjunction 'swie,' e.g. 'swie vil ein valschiu kleider treit' (*Minnesangs Frühling*, 24, 7), or by 'swie' + adj. or adv. + sô, e.g. 'swie harte sô in durste' (cf. Blatz, II, p. 1196) or again, probably, by the use of 'so + adj. + wie es wolle' (which is still extant), e.g. Gryphius, *Horribilicribrifax* (Braune's *Neudrucke*, III), p. 14: 'es gehe so hart zu wie es wolle; man bleibet dennoch nicht von Gott verlassen.' The negative 'nie' in a subordinate clause as in the *Parzival* passage could then be accounted for by assuming contamination of the normal positive concession by the influence of the principal sentences containing 'nie sô' of type A, i.e. 'ern sî nie sô ellende' is the product of 'ern ist nie so ellende, ern zerbere...' and 'swie ellende [so] er sî, er zerbert doch....' The same explanation would then hold good for the other Germanic languages, showing 'nie' in subordination. It seems on the face of it somewhat simpler than the one offered by Mätzner, III, p. 139, which easily outstrips the 'never so' construction itself in the matter of complexity and which may fittingly close this investigation. 'Das Eindringen der Negation in das konzessive Glied erklärt sich aus der Voraussetzung des Redenden, dass die Grad- oder Artbestimmung, aus welcher eine dem Hauptsatze entgegengesetzte Folgerung hergeleitet werden könnte, schlechthin nicht verwirklicht zu denken ist'!

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

ADDENDUM.—Since going to press I have received from Professor Priebsch two additional instances, from the Mnl. *Roman van den riddere metter mouwen* (ed. Bertha M. van der Stempel in the Bibliotheek van Mnl. Letterkunde). One is of 'noch so':

ll. 3679 f.:

al ware huere noch alse fel,
huere sal hier nu vele verliesen.

The other contains 'noit so' (which does not occur in any of the other Mnl. quotations, cf. p. 362 *supra*):

ll. 2274 f.:

hine hadde noit so goden vrient,
hine sprac hem lachter onverdient.

[1] Cf. in Latin the use of 'in-' as an intensive, particularly in popular speech. See E. Löfstedt, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität*, p. 117, and in Greek the use of 'α-.'

GEORG RUDOLF WECKHERLIN'S MODELS.

The sources of Weckherlin's poems have been investigated by the following:

C. P. Conz, *Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften Rudolph Weckherlins. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts.* Ludwigsburg, 1803.

E. Höpfner, *G. R. Weckherlins Oden und Gesänge. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung.* Berlin, 1865.

Gedichte von G. R. Weckherlin. Herausgegeben von K. Goedeke. Leipzig, 1873.

W. Bohm, *Englands Einfluss auf Georg Rudolf Weckherlin* (Göttingen dissertation). Göttingen, 1893.

Georg Rudolf Weckherlins Gedichte, herausgegeben von Hermann Fischer. Tübingen, 1894–5.

Also Herder in *Zerstreute Blätter.* Fünfte Sammlung (Neue Auflage), 1811, of which the preface is dated 1793, and in the *Deutsches Museum* of 1778 and 1779.

Of these authorities by far the most helpful is Fischer, partly because he summarises, with few omissions, the results of his predecessors (except Herder), and also because he was able, though he does not say so specifically anywhere in his edition of Weckherlin's poems, to profit very materially, as regards the French sources, by the valuable notes discovered in the papers of the late Ferdinand Picard (1866–1890), which were handed to Fischer by Ernst Martin.

Of the earlier authorities Herder is remarkable as having, already in the eighteenth century, drawn attention to the origin of the only three poems, leaving out the epigrams, which are directly imitated from English models, namely:

(*a*) *Kennzaichen eines Glückseeligen Lebens* ('Wie Glückseelig ist dessen Leben'). Fischer, I, p. 148.

This is an adaptation of *The Character of a Happy Life* by Sir Henry Wotton (1568–1639). Herder refers (*Zerstreute Blätter*, 1793, p. 273) to Percy's *Reliques* (I, p. 320). Conz (p. 53, note) is

aware of Herder's priority, but later investigators, including Bohm who refers to Goedeke, repeat Herder's information without giving him the credit.

(*b*) *Die Lügin* ('Geh durch die Welt, O meine sehl'). Fischer, I, pp. 272 ff.

Herder (*Deutsches Museum*, 1778, Bd. III, pp. XXVII–XXXIX) shows that this piece is closely modelled on *The Soul's Errand*, of which, misled by Percy in his *Reliques* (II, p. 306), he believed Sir Walter Raleigh to be the author, whereas the piece is by Joshua Sylvester, the translator of Du Bartas. Conz (p. 53) repeats Herder. Höpfner (p. 7) acknowledges Herder's priority, and corrects his attribution of *The Soul's Errand* to Sir Walter Raleigh. Goedeke, Bohm, and Fischer make no mention of Herder, and Bohm, who deals almost exclusively with the English sources, as the title of his thesis indicates, simply gives an abrupt reference to Goedeke, without any mention of Herder.

(*c*) *Ulysses und Sirene* ('Kom her, du wehrter Griech, kom her'). Fischer, I, p. 279.

Herder (*Deutsches Museum*, 1779, Bd. II, p. 307) traces this poem to Samuel Daniel's *Ulysses and the Siren*. Fischer (II, p. 483), probably because Conz (p. 53, note), Höpfner (p. 17, note), and Goedeke (p. 141, note) had already done so, refers to Herder, but Bohm (p. 46) is again content with a peremptory reference to Goedeke.

Apart from the three pieces mentioned above, Bohm (p. 46), who has altogether overdone the English influence, places among the poems directly imitated from English the dainty song entitled *Liebliches Gespräch von der Liebe* (Fischer, I, p. 177), which he thinks is modelled on the song of William Drummond of Hawthornden, of which the opening line is: 'Shepherd lovest thou me well[1].' F. Picard had pointed to Jean Passerat (*Poésies françaises*, ed. Blanchemain, I, p. 141) as Weckherlin's source. Fischer (II, p. 479) leaves the question open, as does also G. Waterhouse in his recently published volume on *The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1914, p. 15). Neither the metre nor the phraseology of the German version gives any clue, but as Drummond's poem was published for the first time in 1711, in the folio edition of his *Works*, many years after Weckherlin's death, it may be confidently asserted that the German poet followed Passerat (whom by the way Drummond

[1] L. E. Kastner, *The Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, Manchester, 1913, vol. II, p. 221.

acknowledges as his model), and not Drummond. Similarly (p. 75) Bohm refers Weckherlin's epigram *Von der hipschen Tilgen* (Fischer, II, p. 447) to Drummond's *Kala's Complaint*[1]. Here again Drummond is not the source, but Desportes (ed. Michiels, p. 443), from whom Weckherlin has made other borrowings. All three pieces go back to a Latin original of P. Zanchi (*Delitiæ Poet. Ital.*, II, p. 1481); Drummond's version which is by far the freest of the three is quite unlike that of Weckherlin, which, on the contrary, both as regards rhythm and rhyme arrangement, is an exact reproduction of Desportes'. The name of Drummond must accordingly be erased from Bohm's list of English models.

The prefatory poem which introduces the First Book of Weckherlin's *Oden und Gesänge* (1618), as Bohm states (p. 46), may be allowed to owe its origin to Spenser's lines 'To His Booke,' prefixed to the *Shepheard's Calendar*. Both the beginning and the end agree almost literally. It is more than doubtful however whether Weckherlin's *Amor betrogen* (Fisher, I, p. 156) goes back to Spenser's Epigram III (Globe edition, p. 596), which itself is obviously translated from Marot's Epigram CIII (ed. Jannet, III, p. 44). Weckherlin's version is much more diluted than that of Spenser or of Marot, and he may possibly have had an Italian model of later date which I have been unable to discover. Bohm (p. 52) also sees a resemblance between Weckherlin's *Brautlied zu Ehren der Hochzeit Filanders und seiner Cloris* (Fischer, I, p. 237) and Carew's *A Rapture* (ed. Hazlitt, p. 62), but in this case there can be no doubt that he has been carried away by his imagination. On the other hand it may be admitted that the sonnet entitled *Traum* (Fischer, I, p. 437), in the *Gaistliche und Weltliche Gedichte* (1641), is a free paraphrase of a certain passage in Spenser's *The Ruines of Time* (Bohm, p. 64). Not reckoning the Epigrams which will be considered presently, this disposes of the poems which Bohm considers to be translations or paraphrases of English models. The other pieces, apart from the one last quoted, which Bohm places under the rubric 'Freiere Dichtungen auf Grund englischer Vorlagen,' can be unhesitatingly rejected as having no direct connection with the English poems to which he refers them. In Weckherlin's epigrams however Bohm (pp. 73–75) has traced five with certainty (nos. 167, 168, 190, 192 and 198 in Fischer's edition) to Donne, and two to Sir John Harrington (nos. 199 and 363 in Fischer), of which the second in Harrington had already been identified by Höpfner (p. 27, note). Sir Edward Shirburne,

[1] L. E. Kastner, *op. cit.*, I, p. 25.

whom Bohm (p. 75) quotes as a parallel in connection with two epigrams of Weckherlin (nos. 396 and 408 in Fischer), must be left out of account, as his *Miscellaneous Poems*, which contain a considerable number of epigrams, appeared (1651) after Weckherlin had ceased to publish—in fact only two years before Weckherlin's death. The net result then, as far as the English influence on Weckherlin is concerned, is that Bohm has added six short epigrams, one sonnet, and the short poem prefixed to the First Book of the *Oden und Gesänge*, to those of Weckherlin's poems which Herder had already traced to English models. It is true that he has also traced four of Weckherlin's epigrams to similar compositions of Owen, but that does not directly concern us here. We may thus conclude that Bohm has exaggerated the English influence even more than is generally believed. The fact is that Weckherlin, in spite of his prolonged sojourn in England, owes comparatively little to English literature. He was essentially a follower of the Pléiade, just as Opitz was; although no inconsiderable number of his poems are translations or paraphrases of complete poems of Ronsard or of his associates, he preferred to borrow single strophes or to weave in passages or single lines from one or more French models in the poetic canvas after the manner of his master Opitz, as Picard has shown, to whose researches, utilized by Fischer, very little has been added subsequently as regards the French sources.

Despite the fact that Weckherlin was apparently well acquainted with Italian literature, judging from the numerous quotations in the original, from Ariosto, Tasso and Guarini, which occur in his *Kurtze Beschreibung*, etc. (1618), he has not so far been shown to owe much to the Italians. Conz (p. 94) says quite rightly that the sonnets entitled respectively *Ihrer Schönheit wunderliche Würckung* (Fischer, I, p. 463) and *Ihr Lob ist unaussprechlich* (Fischer, I, p. 463) are modelled on the sonnet of Petrarch, *Chi vuol veder quantunque può Natura*. Goedeke (p. 290, note) merely observes in a general way that the numerous conceits contained in Weckherlin's amatory sonnets point to Italian models. Fischer (II, p. 492) refers to Conz for the first sonnet mentioned by the latter, but is otherwise silent. However the Italian influence in Weckherlin is much more considerable than these bare hints would lead us to conclude, as I will proceed to show.

The lengthy dialogue, *Die Ros* (Fischer, I, p. 483), is imitated from a similar piece of Marino, bearing the same rubric, which will be found in the Second Part of his *Lira*; and the sonnet *Sie ist steinin* (Fischer, I, p. 466) is transmuted, with a few additions, from one of Marino's

madrigals, taken from the Third Part of the same collection, as the following quotations will show:

Was kan uns, Amor, doch vor ihrem
stolz bewahren?
Umbsunst seind deine pfeil, umbsunst
ist mein Unfall,
Je mehr Ich unsre schand mit ihrem
lob erschall,
Je weniger Sie mich vermeinet zu
entfahren.
Dem blaichen Agstein gleich ist der
strom ihrer haaren,
Ihr runde kehl und hals ist pur als
ein Cristall,
Ein Marber ihre brust, das wärtzlein
ein Corall,
Ein alabaster glat die hände offen-
baren:
Und ihre zween augstern seind funck-
ende Saphir,
Ein lachender Rubin auff ihrem mund
prachtieret,
Von hartestem deemant hat Sie ein
hertz in ihr.
Ist es ein wunder dan, dass Sie (stoltz)
triumfieret,
Amor, und ist so hart stehts gegen
dir und Mir,
Wan Sie die Natur selbs gantz steinin
geformieret?

Beltà crudele.

E' labra hà di rubino,
Et occhi hà di Zeffiro
La bella, e cruda Donna, ond' io
sospiro.
Ha d' alabastro fino
La man, che volge del tuo carro il
freno,
Di marmi il seno, e di diamante il
core.
Qual merauiglia Amore,
S' à tuoi strali, a miei pianti ella si
dura?
Tutta di pietre la formò Natura.

I have not detected any other debts to the author of *l'Adone*—which is not surprising when one compares Weckherlin's rather jejune style with Marino's sensuous diction and elaborate hyperboles. In one sonnet at least Weckherlin has risen to the height of the giddiest of Marino's *concetti*, but that sonnet (Fischer, I, p. 469) is not imitated from Marino. It is borrowed from Claudio Achillini (1574–1640), one of Marino's most devoted disciples, with whom, as indeed is the case with the majority of Marino's followers, the extravagancies of the master which were the spontaneous product of a too fervid fancy, are due to a conscious and mechanical process:

Ihre Schönheit von Rosen und Gilgen.

In lieblichem geruch auff frischem
grünem thron,
Den tausent Liebelein (auffwartend)
allzeit zieren,
Erhube sich die Ros, mit lächlend-
süssem wohn,
Als blumen-Kayserin frölich zu tri-
umfieren.

Lo sdegno nel bianco volto.

Corteggiata da l' aure e dagli amori,
siede sul trono de la siepe ombrosa,
bella regina de' fioriti odori,
in colorita maestà la rosa.

In reicher Mayestet, gleichlos in ihrem wohn,
Mit unbeflöcktem pracht liess sich die Gilg aufführen,
Vermeinend, demnach ihr allein gebühr die Cron,
Als Königin das land der blumen zu regieren.
Alsbald bewögte sich beeder Princessin schoss
Durch eyfer und hochmuht, der offt die Schönheit quälet,
Sie fangen an den streit, und sparen kein geschoss:
Jedoch ihr hassz in lieb (weil Amors raht nicht fehlet)
Verkehret, hat zu letzt zugleich die Gilg und Ros
Auff ewerm angesicht zu prachtieren, vermählet.

Superbo anch' ei per gli odorati onori,
mirasi il giglio al piè turba odorosa
d' ossequïosi e di devoti fiori,
e lo scettro ne vuole e non ha posa.
S' arman di spine e d' archi, e dánno segno
fra lor di guerra; alfin, prendon consiglio
d' esser consorti a la corona, al regno.
Cosi nel volto tuo bianco e vermiglio,
Filli, cangiato in imeneo lo sdegno,
veggio la rosa maritarsi al giglio[1].

Achillini[2] is little read now except by those who peep in the more remote and recondite corners. Yet in his day he had many admirers, and the sonnet he addressed to Louis XIII, who after the capture of La Rochelle had come to Susa and relieved Casale, was on the lips of all his contemporaries:

Sudate, o fochi, a preparar metalli,
e voi, ferri vitali, itene pronti,
ite di Paro a sviscerare i monti
per inalzar colossi al re de' Galli.
Vinse l' invitta ròcca e de' vassalli
spezzò gli orgogli a le rubelle fronti,
e machinando inusitati ponti
diè fuga ai mari e gli converse in valli.
Volò quindi su l' Alpi e il ferro strinse,
e con mano d' Astrea gli alti litigi,
temuto solo e non veduto, estinse.
Ceda le palme pur Roma a Parigi:
ché se Cesare venne e vidi e vinse,
venne, vinse e non vide il gran Luigi[3].

Weckherlin had again recourse to Achillini in the sonnet (Fischer, II, p. 344) entitled *Eine schöne Bettlerin*, which first appeared in *Weltliche Gedichte oder Oden und Gesänge* (Amsterdam, 1648). In this case also the German poet selected one of Achillini's most typical compositions:

Als von mir eine Fraw, von Gottes reicher hand
Mit grösserer Schönheit dan haab und gut verehret,

Sciolta il crin, rotta i panni e nuda il piede,
donna, cui fe' lo ciel povera e bella,

[1] *Poesie di Clavdio Achillini*...Bologna, 1632, p. 169.
[2] On Achillini cf. Antonio Belloni, *Il Seicento*, Milano (no date), pp. 85–87.
[3] *Poesie*, p. 187.

Mit fliegend-schönem haar, und lumpechtem gewand
Umb Got in ihrer noht ein stücklein gelts begehret:
Empfand mit andern ich, dass ihrer augen brand
Vil mehr dan ihre bit mit lieb das hertz versehret,
Und ihr haupt, aug und leib sich (ihrem armen stand
Zu wider) einen schatz unschätzlich reich vermehret.
Darumb, O Reiche Fraw, sprach seufzend ich zu ihr,
Was bettlet diser mund, der würdig zu befehlen?
Und dessen Reichtumb mich arm machet gegen dir?
Dan weder Rubin ihm noch reine Perlein fehlen,
Und das Gold deines haupts will dass selbs (Bettler) wir
Uns deiner freindlichkeit und lieb mittreich befehlen.

con fioca voce e languida favella
mendicava per Dio poca mercede.
Fa di mill' alme, intanto, avare prede
al fulminar de l' una e l' altra stella;
e di quel biondo crin l' aurea procella
a la sua povertá togliea la fede.
— A che fa—le diss'io—si vil richiesta
la bocca tua d' orïental lavoro,
ov' Amor sul rubin la perla inesta?
Ché se vaga sei tu d' altro tesoro,
china la ricca e preziosa testa,
ché pioveran le chiome i membi d' oro[1].

As I have had access to the first edition (1632) only of Achillini's poems, and as Weckherlin not improbably made use of one of the later enlarged editions, it may well be that his indebtedness to the Italian poet is more considerable than these notes would show.

L. E. Kastner.

Manchester.

[1] *Poesie*, p. 187. This sonnet, it may be mentioned, was utilized by the French poet Claude de Malleville (1597–1647) for a series of Stances, entitled *Sur une belle gueuse*, for a madrigal, and for two sonnets (cf. *Poésies du sieur de Malleville*, Paris, 1659, pp. 167–175).

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

A Note on the M. E. 'Cleanness.'

Lot's reception of the heavenly messengers in the above poem contains an extra-biblical circumstance which has never been explained. It occurs in lines 817 f. as follows:

Loth þenne ful ly3tly loke3 hym aboute,
And his men amonestes mete for to dy3t,
'Bot þenkke3 on hit be þrefte what þynk so 3e make,
For wyth no sour ne no salt serve3 hym never.'
Bot 3et I wene þat þe wyf hit wroth to dyspyt,
And sayde softely to hir self, 'Þis unsavere hyne
Love3 no salt in her sauce, 3et hit no skyl were
þat oþer burne be boute þa3 boþe be nyse.'
Þenne ho savere3 with salt her seue3 uchone,
Agayne þe bone of þe burne þat hit forboden hade,
And als ho scelt hem in scorne þat wel her skyl knewen.
Why wat3 ho wrech so wod, ho wrathed oure Lorde.

This passage also plays an important part in the conclusion of the Lot story. In accounting for the punishment of Lot's wife, the poet reverts to the episode of the salt. Thus lines 994 f. read:

For his make wat3 myst þat on þe mount lenged
In a stonen statue þat salt savor habbes,
For two fautes þat þe fol wat3 founde in mistrauþe;
On, ho served at þe soper salt bifore Dry3tyn;
And syþen, ho blusched hir behynde, þa3 hir forboden were.
For on ho standes a ston, and salt for þat oþer,
And alle lyst on hir lik þat arn on launde bestes.

It is needless to say there is nothing in *Genesis* xix like this story of the salt. In the legends of the Jews, however, there are several stories which throw some light on the passage in *Cleanness*, and presumably have something to do with it. I say presumably, because there are differences in some details of the stories, and because I can not now point to an immediate source of the passage in the Middle English poem. Some things may be explained however.

Lot's command to his 'men,' that they should put 'no sour ne no salt' in the food seems to be explained by an addition to the biblical

story in *Genesis Rabba*, ch. xlviii[1]. This tells that the angels visited Lot on the passover, and therefore it is said in the Bible (*Gen.* xix, 3) Lot prepared for them unleavened bread. This bread must contain neither yeast nor salt, for even the latter causes slight fermentation. To-day, also, the Jewish passover cakes must contain no salt. In this respect, therefore, the Middle English poet was following good Hebrew tradition. Professor Ginzberg also notices that the Hebrew word *hamez* means both 'sour' and 'unleavened.'

Curiously enough other legends of the Jews are at variance with this story in the matter of the salt. One says a great quarrel had arisen between Lot and his wife on account of the salt. Lot said 'Give some salt to the heavenly visitors,' that is in token of hospitality. But the wife answered, 'What, do you also wish to introduce this bad custom here?' Refusing to give the salt, she is later transformed into the pillar as a warning to others to be hospitable[2].

Still another Jewish legend is more accessible in Professor Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews* (1912), I, 254. This tells us that the angels were at first unwilling to accept Lot's hospitality, although they had accepted Abraham's as soon as offered. The reason is that 'it is a rule of good breeding to show reluctance when an ordinary man invites one, but to accept the invitation of a great man at once.' The story then proceeds:

> Lot, however, was insistent, and carried them into his house by main force. At home he had to overcome the opposition of his wife, for she said, 'If the inhabitants of Sodom hear of this, they will slay thee.' Lot divided his dwelling into two parts, one for himself and his guests, the other for his wife, so that, if aught happened, his wife would be spared. Nevertheless it was she who betrayed him. She went to a neighbour and borrowed some salt, and to the question whether she could not have supplied herself with salt during daylight hours she replied, 'We had enough salt until some guests came to us; for them we needed more.' In this way the presence of strangers was bruited abroad in the city.

The first of these legends is the one which has the closest relation to the Middle English poem. Indeed, it explains the first passage in *Cleanness* entirely, and the medieval poet was doubtless capable of uniting the disobedience of Lot's wife in salting the unleavened bread and the punishment recorded in the Bible. Or he may have known more than one of the Hebrew legends and have been influenced by parts of at least two. In any case the biblical story of Lot in this Middle English poem has clearly been modified by legendary lore of the Hebrews.

[1] Edition of Theodor, p. 490. I am indebted to Professor Louis Ginzberg of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America for this and one or two other references and citations.

[2] *Genesis Rabba*, ch. i, 3; edition of Theodor, p. 521.

Between this ultimate source of the salt story and its use in *Cleanness* I know no intervening link. The Hebrew legend does not seem to occur in the Latin Church Fathers, and it is not found in any Old French source accessible to me. It does not appear, it may be noted, in the Old French *Mistère du vieil testament*, though that is too late for influence on the English poet. Besides, I find no trace of it in other English works in which it might be expected, as the Old or the Middle English *Genesis*, the *Cursor Mundi*, the *Miracle Plays*, or the *Travels of Mandeville*, the writer of which does say that the pillar of salt was still standing in his time. It is perhaps not too much to believe that the Middle English poet was directly acquainted with the Hebrew commentaries on the Bible.

Oliver Farrar Emerson.

Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.

'Jacke Jugeler,' ll. 256–259.

When wee came yender, there dyd I see
My mayster kisse gentilwomen tow or three
And to come emongs others my thought bysye
He had a myruayllus great phantasye.

I quote from the recent edition of the play by Professor W. H. Williams, who has the following note on l. 258:

My thought, me thought. Cf. l. 191.
bysye, i.e. [he was] busy. Hazlitt unnecessarily changes to 'I see.'

It seems to me that an emendation *is* required, and I have little doubt that the true reading is 'my thought by 's ye,' that is, 'me-thought by his eye.'

The spelling 'ye' = 'eye' is found in the play at l. 576 'my yes, nose and lyppes,' l. 821 'That he...hath sine [seen] w^{t} his ye,' and l. 827 'I wold myne owne yes in no wyse belyue.'

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Two Exits in 'Othello.'

It has frequently been observed that in the early editions of Shakespeare stage directions are found placed somewhat differently from what modern usage would require. A special class of such cases is made

up of entrances and exits indicated a little in advance of the proper moment for the appearance or disappearance of the character in question—a phenomenon commonly explained by the fact that the stage direction is originally for the information of the actor. (See, for example, the comments of Dyce and Furness on an exit of Jaques' early in the fourth act of *As You Like It*, New Variorum edition, page 213.)

A case of this character has lately occurred to me as not having been noted in any of the editions of *Othello*, and it is one where the correction—if one may call it so—is not without significance for the adjacent text. In IV, ii, 106, Emilia's indignant utterance, 'Here's a change indeed!' is followed by the direction *Exit*, whereupon Desdemona says:

> 'Tis meet I should be used so, very meet.
> How have I been behaved, that he might stick
> The small'st opinion on my least misuse?

Clearly the first of these lines is somewhat at odds with the other two. In the one, Desdemona declares the complete propriety of Othello's conduct; in the others she finds it a mystery. The answer is that the first line is addressed to Emilia, and that it is only the second sentence which is soliloquy. No doubt this has been apprehended by many readers; but since the *Exit* precedes the beginning of the speech in all the editions—so far as I have examined them—it is also true that many readers must have failed to apprehend it, and so have missed one of the significant touches that delineate Desdemona's character. In other words, rallying to her ladyhood as the impetuous Emilia comments on the situation, Desdemona tells her with dignity, 'Tis meet I should be used so,' and so begins the course of splendid mendacity which reaches its climax on her death-bed.

At the end of the same act I am disposed to think (though with somewhat less assurance) that another exit of Emilia's is misplaced, and another of Desdemona's soliloquies affected. This is not to be explained as in the instance just discussed, for the exit is not anticipated, but—it seems to me—delayed, or rather merged with the *Exeunt* that marks the end of the act. Emilia, it will be recalled, has been instructed to go away and leave her mistress alone. She does so, one may suppose, as Desdemona says 'Good-night, good-night' (l. 105). What follows, then,

> Heaven me such uses send,
> Not to pick bad from bad, but by bad mend!

is really soliloquy, and I imagine is always treated as such on the stage. While this circumstance does not affect its meaning, it surely enhances its beauty; and this should be brought out for the reader by the indication of a separate exit for Emilia. Of course on the modern stage, where the curtain falls, Desdemona has no exit at all.

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN.

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA.

A NEGLECTED WORK OF PRE-RESTORATION CRITICISM.

It is surprising that such an interesting piece of literary criticism as Sir Richard Baker's *Theatrum Redivivum* (1662)[1], a reply to Prynne's *Histriomastix*, has been so neglected by students of Elizabethan literature, especially by those who have concerned themselves with criticism relating to the pre-Restoration theatre. By none of these is Baker's defence of the stage discussed. Yet this neglected work is of more intrinsic merit than several of those treated fully by these scholars; for it contains a good deal of that common sense which some say was lacking to the early apologists of the theatre.

Baker's production has not only been neglected; it has recently occasioned the following misleading statement from such an eminent scholar as Mr J. D. Wilson, who, speaking of the agitation caused by the Civil War, remarks: 'This, probably, also accounts for the fact that Prynne's book, apparently, remained unanswered until 1662, when Sir Richard Baker published his *Theatrum Redivivum*[2].'

In connection with this statement it should be noted that Sir Richard Baker died in Fleet Prison in February, 1644/45, where he had taken refuge about 1635. It should also be noted that the book was written several years before the author's death. The exact date of composition cannot be determined perhaps; still internal evidence indicates that the production was written before the closing of the theatres. On page 69 Baker himself gives the approximate date of composition, when he states that it has been 'almost fourscore years' from 'the beginning of our late famous Queen Elizabeth to the present.' I should say,

[1] The production was re-issued in 1670 with the title *Theatrum Triumphans or a Discourse of Plays*. On a fly-leaf of the copy of this latter volume in the Library of Congress a former owner has made the following note: 'The Theatre Vindicated Lond. 1661, 8vo. By Sir R. Baker.' No 1661 edition is referred to by Lowndes or other bibliographers.

[2] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VI, p. 458 (note).

therefore, that Baker had contemplated, perhaps had even begun, his work immediately after the appearance of *Histriomastix* in 1632, and completed it soon after his flight to Fleet Prison. Why the piece was not printed until 1661 or 1662 is explained in 'To the Reader' prefaced to the work: 'At length thou art presented with a small Piece, which for many years hath been buried with its Renowned Authour. It appeared not till now, knowing very well, that this late World hath been fitter for Bedlam, then for sober, and Rational Discourses.'

Theatrum Redivivum, then, is to be regarded as pre-Restoration criticism composed before the closing of the theatres. It is impossible in a brief note to discuss the various arguments against Prynne, still it may be said that Baker has the good sense to realize that several of the ponderous arguments of the Puritans deserve only to be laughed out of court. He not only objects to Prynne's lack of a sense of humour; he protests against his lack of reason and his abundance of 'Scolding Invectives,' his self-contradiction, the retention of evidence that tells against Puritan arguments, the misinterpretation of texts, and the multitude of errors of detail. 'Where he hath entituled his Book, a *Tragedie of Actours*,' exclaims Baker, 'he should, if he had done right, have entituled it, *A Comedy of Errours*.' And especially he protests against Prynne's padding, and the massing of material which misses the point in that it applies to heathen amusements and not to contemporary drama.

T. S. Graves.

Durham, N.C., U.S.A.

Crashaw's Translation of Marino's 'La Strage degli Innocenti' ('Sospetto d'Herode').

For the Cambridge edition of Crashaw (1904) the editor, Mr A. R. Waller, made use of the manuscript volume of poems by different authors belonging originally to Archbishop Sancroft (*Bodleian Library* MS. Tanner 465). The table of contents to that volume begins 'M^{r} Crashaw's poëms transcrib'd frõ his own Copie, before they were printed; among w^{ch} are some not printed,' and concludes the index that follows with the entry 'Suspetto di Herode. translated frõ Cav. Marino, p. 287[1].' As Mr Waller pointed out, however, the pages

[1] In the MS. the number of the page is followed by a tick which is an abbreviation-mark for 'cetera.' This has been printed as 'v.'

containing the translation are not included in MS. Tanner 465, so that the Cambridge text of that poem is based only on the printed versions. While looking through some similar volumes in the Bodleian Library for another purpose I found the missing pages, which contain several new and interesting readings, in MS. Tanner 466. The high authority of the manuscript and the obviously corrupt nature of some passages in the printed text that conflict with it seem to justify the publication of the more important variants.

There are two copies of the poem, to be mentioned hereafter as *X* and *Y* respectively, of which the second is that which has the original pagination (beginning 287) referred to in the index. The dated title-page preceding them is as follows: 'La Strage De Gli Innocenti Del Caualier Marino November 25th 1637.' The two copies were not, apparently, made independently from the original, since both agree in certain errors which are not found in the printed editions and which can hardly all have stood in Crashaw's 'own Copie.' In *Y* most of these errors are corrected in another hand. Both *X* and *Y* thus read 'snailes' for 'sailes' in stanza 18, l. 6, and 'shrinke' for 'sinke' in stanza 22, l. 3; and both these mistakes are corrected in *Y*. Some mistakes, however, still remain in *Y*, e.g. 'climbe' for 'clombe' in stanza 28, l. 5.

In the following list of the most important new readings the numbers refer to stanzas and lines, and the reading before the bracket is that of the Cambridge Crashaw, based on *Steps to the Temple*, 1648:

(*a*) (Argomento) 2 *Master*] monarch *XY*.
(*b*) 28, 1 dusky] dusty *XY*.
(*c*) 29, 3 not] now *XY*.
(*d*) 40, 7 impartiall] imperiall *XY*.
(*e*) 44, 5 black] bleake *XY*.
(*f*) 48, 3 lids, for ever] lidds for euer. *X*, lidds forever. *Y*.
(*g*) 51, 1 Herod ——] Herod leige to Cesar *X*, Herod, Leige to Cæsar, *Y*.
(*h*) 51, 3 image] linage *XY*.
(*i*) 64, 4 Lord: Without delay] Lorde wthout delay *X*, Lord without delay. *Y*.

It will be seen that of the MS. readings at least four, viz. (*e*), (*f*), (*g*) and (*h*), represent not only desirable but necessary improvements upon the printed text. In some instances, too, the MS. reading is substantiated by the original Italian; thus in (*a*) 'monarch' corresponds to 'Rè,' in (*g*) 'Leige to Cæsar' corresponds to 'Ligio d'Augusto.' The

curious blank here in the printed texts can hardly be explained with certainty; but taken in conjunction with the changes in (*a*) and (*d*) it seems not impossible to regard it as the work of an over-zealous censor, nervously deleting references to kingship. We are reminded of the censor's doubts about the passage in *Paradise Lost* (I, 594–9) referring to the eclipse that 'with fear of change Perplexes Monarchs.'

In a future edition of Crashaw's works I hope to give a fuller description of these manuscripts and to include other fresh material of biographical and critical interest.

L. C. Martin.

Lund, Sweden.

Thackeray's 'Peg of Limavaddy.'

Thackeray's ballad is very likely in the strict sense of the word original; but I have been struck by the resemblance it bears to the 'Serranilla' of the Marqués de Santillana (1398–1458). The resemblance lies in the metre, in the refrain, in the form of the opening verse, and to some extent in the general subject, the praise of a rustic beauty seen by a traveller. In grace and point Thackeray is far from rivalling his Spanish predecessor.

I will only give the opening verses of the two poems, and leave the matter there. I do not know of any evidence that Thackeray had dipped into Spanish literature.

Santillana.

Faciendo la via
del Calatraveño
à Santa Maria,
vencido del sueño,
por tierra fragosa
perdí la carrera
do vi la vaquera
de la Finojosa.

Thackeray.

Riding from Coleraine
(Famed for lovely Kitty),
Came a Cockney bound
Unto Derry city;
Weary was his soul,
Shivering and sad, he
Bumped along the road
Leads to Limavaddy.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

REVIEWS.

The Theory of Poetry in England. By R. P. Cowl. London: Macmillan. 1914. 8vo. xiv + 320 pp.

Mr Cowl has attempted in this compact volume three things: 'to exhibit in selected documents the historical development of the general theory of poetry from the middle of the sixteenth century to the close of the nineteenth century'; 'to determine from authoritative sources the theoretical principles of the several schools of poetry and criticism'; and 'to present the arguments that have been advanced for or against controverted principles or doctrines.' The collection has been made with industry and learning, and we have no doubt of its utility. But it must be pointed out that the rather ambitious programme above laid down cannot be adequately carried out in a book confined to the opinions of English critics. 'The historical development of the theory of poetry' cannot be 'exhibited' in English documents for the reason that important steps in it were taken on the continent, and owed their character to intellectual conditions there alone prevailing. Thus French classicism from the Pléiade to Boileau may be called a development without grave qualification, if we will; but English classicism from Sidney to Pope is rather a succession of detached or slightly connected tidal waves. Original criticism there has been in England in abundance; but in 'school' criticism, that which sets forth 'the theoretical principles' of this or the other branch of criticism, we have never been so rich as in those heretical adaptations of traditional theory to individual bent, which please our insular genius. Mr Cowl's collection is mainly occupied with the conflict between the Neo-Classical and Romantic theories of poetry, which in a variety of phases and modifications runs through his three centuries. The extracts illustrating the beginning of the 'Romantic Revolt'—especially those from the still not very accessible writings of Hurd, Warton and Young, will no doubt be serviceable. The entire omission, on the other hand, of Shaftesbury and his individual and engaging presentation of the 'classicist' point of view is a serious lacuna. Shaftesbury is probably, when all is said, our most original thinker upon aesthetics before the nineteenth century, and he is still far from having received his due in England. In this and other points Mr Cowl's book would have benefited from recent German studies in eighteenth-century aesthetics. And an older book, H. von

Stein's *Die Entstehung der neueren Ästhetik* (1886), is still, to our thinking, in spite of more elaborate and diffuse successors, the ablest handling of its subject. Not to end on a note of disapproval, we observe the agreeable admission, here and there, among the more solemn debates and arguments, of a pointed *obiter dictum* from the essayists or novelists, such as Sterne's playful diatribe on 'the rules.' 'Great Apollo! if thou art in a giving humour,—give me—I ask no more, but one stroke of native humour, with a single stroke of thy own fire along with it—and send Mercury, with the *rules and compasses*, if he can be spared, with my compliments, to—no matter.'

C. H. Herford.

Manchester.

The Evolution of Technic in Elizabethan Tragedy. By Harriott Ely Fansler. Chicago and New York: Roe, Peterson and Co. 1914. 8vo.

The book would perhaps be more suitably named 'The Evolution of Shakespeare's Technic in Tragedy,' for it is chiefly occupied with that subject; and although its announced aim is to present the phenomena from which Elizabethan tragedy developed its technique and to illustrate this development by Shakespeare, it cannot be justly claimed that the finer subtleties which made his art in tragedy what it was ever became the common fashion of Elizabethan playwrights. By way of showing the technical inheritance passed on to Shakespeare for tragedy, the author analyses carefully the potentialities of the earlier religious plays as regards tragedy figures and motives, notes the influence of *The Spanish Tragedy* in teaching how to centre strongly on Senecan revenge, and in using a Senecan ghost to guide the revenge, and reminds us that Marlowe's contribution to the developing technique was the creation of a powerful protagonist who absorbed in himself all the interest of the play. At the beginning of his career Shakespeare was content with adding as his important contribution a strongly emphasized antagonist who should divide the interest with the chief struggler, and in the end subdue him. As he worked forward, however, in technique and especially in philosophy of life, he believed more and more in placing the struggle and cause for downfall in the protagonist's own nature, and in making the external enemy, or enemies, the inevitable result of conditions there.

Within certain limits of emphasis, few would be inclined to dispute this general theory, and in general it may be said that the book has neither disturbed accepted ideas in any significant way, nor greatly enlarged them. The author's comments upon Shakespeare's gradual mastery of the tragic art are frequently acute and usefully analytic, but it is impossible for many of us to believe that Shakespeare worked with so conscious a method as all the heavy nomenclature used by Professor

Fansler to designate his processes and results would at least suggest. Similarly one must take issue with the second emphasis of the book—that 'the one thing that binds all Elizabethan tragedy together from *Gorboduc* to *The Traitor* and *The Cardinal* is the influence of Seneca.' The influence of Professor Thorndike's *Tragedy* and his articles on the revenge plays is so marked in the book—being more than once acknowledged in general terms—that one cannot help regretting the failure to follow him here to the point of giving some adequate recognition to plays of the non-Senecan sort—especially to the domestic type represented by *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, etc. His influence might have suggested, too, the necessity for reckoning with the Elizabethan and very un-Senecan custom of combining comedy elements with tragedy. Such a custom must inevitably have affected the technique of a tragedy at many points.

The style of the book is greatly injured by its extreme colloquialism, shown in the frequent use of the interrogative sentence, the tendency to coin such words as 'thereforeness,' 'future-looking,' the energetic statement of personal opinions as being personal, etc. These traits take it out of the realm of academic desiccation and frequently cripple a well-wrought argument. Judged rigorously the book can hardly be called a contribution at any point, but it is often interesting in its restatement of accepted ideas and at several points is stimulating.

O. L. Hatcher.

Bryn Mawr, U.S.A.

Shakespeare's Macbeth. Edited with Introduction and Notes by H. J. C. Grierson. (Select Plays of Shakespeare, General Editor, J. C. Smith.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. xl + 172 pp.

This is an excellent edition of the play. It does not aim so directly as Mr Verity's editions do at satisfying the particular needs of Local Examination candidates, and probably it will not oust Mr Verity's *Macbeth* from its special market. But riper students of Shakespeare will find it very fresh and stimulating.

Professor Grierson's Introduction abounds in fine criticism and happy literary illustrations. He takes the view that Lady Macbeth was not merely absorbed in satisfying her husband's ambition, but was ambitious on her own account—that (in spite of I, vii, 48) Macbeth had not communicated to her before the opening of the play any hint of his embryo intention of murdering Duncan—that the play undoubtedly contains additions by Middleton, and possibly passages by an earlier hand which however have been reworked by Shakespeare: and that probably no part of Shakespeare's work has been lost. As to the last thesis, that the play is not defective, it seems to us that Duncan's

invitation to Macbeth (I, iv, 42), 'From hence to Inverness,' etc., is at least surprisingly curt, that the introduction of the Third Murderer needs explanation, and that the passages (II, i, 16) 'and shut up' and (III, ii, 34, etc.) 'Unsafe the while' bear clear signs of mutilation.

The Notes (in which Professor Grierson has been assisted by Mr J. C. Smith) give little ground for criticism. On (III, ii, 51) 'the crow Makes wing to the rooky wood,' we are told that 'rooky' cannot mean 'misty,' as the wood 'roky' belonged to the northern or E. Anglian dialect, and was probably quite unknown to Shakespeare. He is a bold man who would say what was unknown to Shakespeare: but we cannot think that Shakespeare would tell us, as the editors hold, that 'the crow makes way to the rook-haunted wood.'

On (I, iii, 6) 'the rump-fed ronyon,' we are told that this 'is either the scabby creature fed on offal, or the pampered, well-fed scurvy creature who grudges one a chestnut.' But to see how 'chestnut' comes in, one must turn from this edition to the 'Warwick' edition of *Macbeth*, and one will still be at a loss to see how the sense 'grudges one' can be got at. As to the crux (III, iv, 105) 'If trembling I inhabit,' the editors ignore one plausible explanation (pointed out to me by Mr Verity, though not given in his edition) by which 'inhabit' = 'harbour,' as in *As you like it*, III, iii, 10, 'ill-inhabited.' They do not point out the allusion to the *Spanish Tragedy* in III, vi, 5—7 (see *Modern Language Review*, vol. I, p. 54). On V, vii, 82 we are told that 'God be with him' (three syllables in the verse, as 'God be with you' at III, i, 43) is to be pronounced 'God b' with him.' Do not the common 1st Folio forms 'God buy you,' 'God buy' you' rather suggest the pronunciation 'God buy him'?

Mr J. C. Smith provides an Appendix on the structure and staging of the play and another on Prosody. The latter is less easy reading than the similar article by Sir Henry Newbolt in his edition of *Richard II* in this series, but gives more detailed information. Both writers go in our opinion too far in discountenancing the syncopation of syllables in Shakespeare's verse. This appears to be the present tendency, but we incline to think that the treatment of prosody in Professor Herford's *Richard II* ('Warwick Shakespeare') is a safer guide to the young student than that of either Sir Henry Newbolt or Mr Smith. We should ourselves print as two lines the three (I, ii, 37—39):

> As cannons overcharg'd with double cracks;
> So they
> Doubly redoubled strokes upon the foe.

The first line, we believe, is to be read 'As cann'ns o'ercharg'd,' etc. But this is indeed 'against the canon.'

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Bibliography of the Works of Dr John Donne, Dean of St Paul's. By Geoffrey Keynes. Cambridge: printed for the Baskerville Club and sold by Bernard Quaritch, London. 1914. 4to. xii + 168 pp.

All admirers of Donne will be grateful to Mr Geoffrey Keynes and the Baskerville Club for this magnificent and exhaustive bibliography. To his highly expert account of the editions and impressions of each of Donne's works, Mr Keynes has prefixed a short and interesting bibliographical preface. He has further treated the early editions of Walton's *Life*, given a list of the chief contributions to the biography and criticism of the poet, and added appendices on the portraits of Donne, on books which were in his library, and on the works of his son, etc. The book is illustrated by reproductions of engraved portraits of the Dean and of twelve title-pages.

That Mr Keynes' work has been of the most scholarly and thorough kind is made clear by the account of his labours which he has given us in his General Preface, and in particular by his statement that his proof-sheets have been read by Mr Francis Jenkinson, Mr Charles Sayle, Mr A. T. Bartholomew, Mr Cosmo Gordon and Mr H. G. Aldis. Before such an array of witnesses even an *advocatus diaboli* would throw down his brief.

My only contribution is a tentative suggestion that the lady referred to by the younger Donne in a passage quoted on p. 148 was the wife of Sir Lionel Tollemache. Sir Lionel was son of another Sir Lionel who as Vice-Admiral of Suffolk had a dispute with Sir William Withipole of Ipswich about 1630–33, which is reflected in the State Papers Domestic (Charles I) of those years. Lady Tollemache is referred to by Dorothy Osborne (June 18, 1654?) as 'Lady Talmash,' and in this connexion Judge Parry quotes an account written of her by Bishop Burnet, from which it appears that she was beautiful and learned, but of violent character, for a time the Duke of Lauderdale's mistress, and ultimately in 1672 his wife. She was the eldest daughter of William Murray, 1st Earl of Dysart, Charles I's page (or tutor), and in 1670, after her father's death, became in her own right Countess of Dysart. She had eleven children by her former marriage, and her eldest son succeeded her in the earldom of Dysart. She died in 1697.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

A Short History of English. By Henry Cecil Wyld. London: Murray. 1914. 8vo. 240 pp.

Of the making of books on the history of our language there is no end, and many of them are a 'weariness to the flesh' because entirely lacking in freshness and originality of outlook. The present work is

sharply distinguished from such by its novelty of arrangement, by the well-defined limits within which it works, and by the clearness with which it presents not only the many difficulties in the history of English sounds which have been cleared up in the last few years by Jespersen, Luick, Horn and Zachrisson (to name four only among the most fertile and suggestive), but also, and this is even more important, the many issues and problems which are still unsettled, waiting for investigation when we are fully aroused to a sense of their importance.

Of the opening chapters the best is that on *Speech-Sounds*, which is a model of concise and clear presentation. Here the groundwork is laid from which alone it is possible to proceed to a satisfactory description of the historic development of English speech-sounds. Three chapters are then devoted to the history of sounds in the O.E., M.E. and Modern English period. In the second of these chapters, as indeed throughout the book, one of the chief problems which interests Professor Wyld is that of the development of Standard Literary English. Here, we have incorporated for the first time in a history of our language much matter hitherto only accessible in periodical form. We may note especially Luick's important rule about the shortening of Long Vowels in words of three syllables (§ 176) and Wyld's own conclusions as to the treatment of O.E *y* in the M.E. dialects, which mark an epoch in the history of the subject (§ 158). In the chapter on the Modern Period Wyld is inclined to agree in the main with the conclusions of Zachrisson as to the pronunciation of English vowels between 1400 and 1700, and urges the importance of the consideration of the influence of class dialect in determining some of the widely variant versions of early Mod. Eng. sounds given by the grammarians.

The historical sketch of English inflexions is done better and more fully than in any previous grammar, and constitutes one of the most valuable features of the book. The whole volume is enriched by a full and well-arranged bibliography.

A few statements are open to criticism:

(1) (p. 116) 'O. West. Scand. *ai* was preserved much longer than in East. Scand., in fact it still survives in some Swed. Dialects at the present time.'

(2) In § 160, speaking of the later history of O.E. *æ*, it is said that 'The Midland and Northern *ă*-type becomes the predominant, and finally the sole type in the Standard Dialect, and apparently throughout the whole country, as is shown by the testimony of the modern Dialects.' This would seem to leave out of count the N. Engl. and S. Scots pronunciation of such words as *after, path, glad* with [e].

(3) § 332, Note 2. 'In *dǣlan* from *dāljan* the double consonant has been simplified after a long vowel.' Was it ever geminated in that position?

(4) § 352. What is the authority for the pronunciation of *shone* as [soun]?

In the history of Scandinavian *au* (§ 180) we may note further examples of *au* > *ō*, as in *Copeland* (earlier *Coupland*) and *Copmanthorpe*

(for *Coupmanthorp*) with shortening of the vowel, and in the history of French *eau* § 172 it may be noted that *Beaumont*, Nthb., is locally known as [bi·mənt], while *Beaufront*, Nthb., was in the eighteenth century called [bi·vrən], and *Beamish*, co. Durham, is from *Beaumis*. In all alike there is evidence for an alternative pronunciation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with initial [bju·-].

It is to be regretted that there are a considerable number of printers' errors and slips of various kinds. We may note: p. 17 (top), reference to contents of Harl. MS. 2253 is misplaced; p. 75 l. 20, *ofor* for *eofor*; § 116, *ċīosiþ* for **ċīošiþ*; § 122, *drighten* for *dryhten*; § 141, § 138 for 139; § 145, *ċief* for *ċeaf*; § 161, *tæccan* for *tæcean*; § 162 l. 18, [ē] for [ī]; § 163 l. 14, 156 for 165; § 214, *iġe* for *īeġ*; § 218 l. 3 (?) *of* for *or*; § 236 l. 3, 263 for 163; § 240 l. 2, p. 117 for 120; § 253 n. 4, § 108 for 109; § 312, *eage* for *ēage*; § 323 *urðra* for *furðra*; § 325, *dearuum* for *dearnum*; § 334 l. 12, *temma*(*n*) for *temmen*; § 336 (?) *geþanian* for *geþauien*; § 342, *bidden* for *biddan*, *sǣlon* for *sǣton*; § 351, *sprœcon* for *sprǣcon*; § 355 (?) *cwn* for *cwm*; § 358, *blēawon* for *blēowon*; § 360, *conde*, *konde* for *coude*, *koude*.

These corrections are for the most part trivial and obvious, but are given here as it is to be hoped that there will soon be sufficient demand for this excellent book to make a corrected reprint possible.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Beowulf: A Metrical Translation into Modern English. By JOHN R. CLARK HALL. Cambridge: University Press. 1914. 8vo. xii + 114 pp.

In attempting to make a metrical version of the *Beowulf* in modern English, Dr Clark Hall has undertaken one of the most difficult tasks possible for a translator, and we intend no reflection on his ability and scholarship when we say that in our opinion he has not succeeded. English scholars have wrangled over the best metre and the best diction for turning into English verse the great epics of Greece and Rome, and they have not yet reached agreement. But that problem is relatively an easy one. The translator has before him a highly finished work of art by a great poet of a civilised and cultured society. As he is to translate for cultured readers of an equally civilised society possessing a roll of noble poets, he may legitimately use the language and technique shaped and perfected through the centuries by these poets, who themselves have been influenced more or less by the Greeks and Romans. The translator, if he ignores English poetic tradition and adopts a phraseology and technique of his own, will produce a version which will not only fail to please his readers but will also fail to give them a correct notion of the original poem. In the case of the *Beowulf*, not to speak of other Old English poems, the conditions of the problem are different. Between the Old Germanic prosody and that of English

verse of the last six hundred years there is a great gulf, and there is an equally great difference in vocabulary and phraseology. Further, whereas quite accurate and even pleasing English hexameters of the Greek and Roman pattern can be and have been made, no imitations in Modern English of the alliterative metre of Old English, however accurate, can be honestly said to please the ear of an English reader, whether he be acquainted or not with the Old English metrical system. The word-stress of the older language differs greatly from our own; quantity of vowels no longer plays a vital part in our verse, and above all the rhythmical groups of the two stages of the language are entirely different. But after all, the greatest difficulty for the translator does not lie in the metre. He can substitute for the alliterative verse a familiar modern scheme, say the four-beat (octosyllabic) or five-beat (decasyllabic) verse, habitually used by our modern poets for narrative and epic poems. What constitutes the greatest obstacle for the translator into English verse of an Old English poem is the peculiar character of the vocabulary and phraseology of the latter. The Old English poet had a stock of ready-made compounds or *clichés* and of 'kennings,' or equivalents, which he was obliged to use if he wished to interest and please his readers, or rather hearers. It is precisely these stock words and phrases that the translator finds so unmanageable. If he translates them literally every time, the result is clumsy and wearisome. If he tries to render them by the language of modern poetry, he conveys to the reader a false impression of the original. To the Anglo-Saxon hearer or reader the *Beowulf* was a splendid poetic achievement, faithfully observing the traditional rules of the poet's craft and its traditional phraseology. It was good to hear, stirring, full of melody, of harmonies, of familiar associations of ideas and words; it was, in a word, great poetry. Now Dr Clark Hall's version is not poetry at all; it is not verse; it has hardly even rhythm; and the same criticism applies to all the other so-called metrical versions of the *Beowulf* in Modern English. Dr Hall mentions in his preface the following as his chief guiding principles of translation:

(1) To try to get as close as possible to the rhythm of the original.

(2) To make his rendering acceptable to persons unfamiliar with the structure of Old English verse.

(3) To give four well-marked stresses in each line.

(4) To be as literal as possible.

An examination of any page in the book, indeed of any consecutive ten lines, will show that only one, the last, of these intentions is properly carried into effect. We take at random lines 739 ff.

> The terrible fiend had no mind to delay
> but quickly he seized, as first victim of all,
> a sleeping campaigner and ate him, unwarned,—
> bit his bone-binding thews, drank the blood up in streams,
> swallowed bite after bite. He had eaten him up—
> the dead man—in a trice, yea, his feet and his hands.

And then, stepping forth, to close quarters he came
and seized with his hands the hero at rest—
the valiant in heart— he reached out against
the foe with his claw, who grasped him at once
and with purpose of mind threw his weight on his arm.

As we read this passage we fail at first to perceive any rhythm, but after a time we begin to notice a peculiar 'bumpy' effect, and finally we gain the impression of an irregular 'anapaestic' rhythm. The space left in the middle of each line obscures the perception of this rhythm, and we are confronted by a monotonous, exasperating series of jolts. Anything more unlike the original Old English metre can hardly be conceived. The uninstructed reader will not, we think, find this sort of thing acceptable; the instructed reader will shudder. Instead of four well-marked stressed syllables in a line we repeatedly come across five and even six; for example in

but quíckly he seízed, as fírst víctim of áll
swállowed bíte after bíte. He had eáten him úp,

and actually seven in

bít his bóne-binding théws, dránk his bloód úp in streáms.

We are driven to the conclusion that Dr Hall, when reading his translation, arbitrarily suppresses the stress on words that are normally full-stressed, in order to attain his desired object, viz. four strongly-stressed syllables in each line. In this way he adds outrage on his own language to misrepresentation of the old poet's technique. The translation is literal; it is likewise bald. Dr Hall would have done well not to try to improve on his excellent prose version of the poem.

We are convinced that the task of producing a metrical version of the *Beowulf* is within the powers of any cultured person with a turn for writing simple, unsophisticated verse, provided that he realises exactly the nature of that task. In the first place let him understand that the vocabulary of modern poetry, with its myriad associations and allusiveness, is a great snare to the translator. In the second place, he must beware of the archaisms of language which many think most suitable for the translating of Old English poetry. In the third place, let him give up the attempt to reproduce the old metre; let him in its stead use rhyming couplets, whether of short or long lines. Blank verse is out of the question. Lastly, let him bear in mind that the author of the *Beowulf* is not self-conscious like the average modern English poet, is severely practical, economical of speech, straight, simple, bound hand and foot by tradition, yet unconscious of his bonds.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

MINOR NOTICES.

There is no edition of Blake nearly so convenient for the ordinary reader as that lately published in the 'Oxford Edition of Standard Authors,' edited by Dr Sampson (London, H. Milford, 1913). It contains first the smaller poems, as in the editor's larger edition, with textual notes recording Blake's own variations, but without the 'variorum' readings; then the minor prophetic books complete, including the hitherto unpublished *French Revolution*, Book I, known to us only from a single copy, which appears to be merely a page-proof, and not an example of a published edition; and finally selections from *The Four Zoas*, *Milton* and *Jerusalem*, the verses from *The Gates of Paradise*, *The Ghost of Abel*, and several prose selections, including the passage from the *Descriptive Catalogue* describing the Canterbury Pilgrims. The accuracy of the text is guaranteed by the editor's previous work, and the bibliographical introduction is of great value. To have all this brought within the compass of a single volume at so small a price is a great boon to the reader, and the book may be set down as one of the most valuable of the series to which it belongs. It should be added that it contains, besides a reproduction of Phillips's portrait of Blake, photographic facsimiles of the title-pages of the original editions.

In the 'World's Classics' series there are useful reprints of John Galt's novel, *The Entail*, and of George Eliot's *Romola* (London, H. Milford, 1913), both very convenient volumes, not too large to be carried in the pocket, nor too small in print to be easily read. Mr Ayscough, who contributes an introduction on Galt's position as a novelist, expresses wonder that he should be neglected by readers to whom Scott and Jane Austen are indispensable. The reason, however, is fairly obvious. Galt was not a good story-teller; the plot of the *Entail*, which the present editor considers his master-piece, is a very rambling affair, constructed chiefly with a view to bringing in good things; and though the author has undoubtedly a power of character drawing which is often very entertaining, yet his characters are apt to be rather oddities than fair specimens of humanity, and the whole has a rather provincial air. In fact it is probable that where he makes least attempt to tell a story and is most avowedly provincial, as in the *Annals of the Parish*, he succeeds best. The reprint of *Romola* has a pleasantly written introduction by Miss Viola Meynell, drawing attention first to George Eliot's power of tracing the development of a human soul, of an egoist like Tito, for example, and in particular of a woman's soul, of Romola, or of Maggie Tulliver. In the former case comparison

is made with Meredith's picture of a completed character exhibiting itself, and in the latter with Thackeray's presentation of soulless women. Then with regard to *Romola* in particular, she shews how elaborately the author prepared herself for this great effort, and how deeply it ploughed into her life. As to the religious bearing, she points out how *Romola* is in fact a great manifesto against mysticism, whether it was written intentionally as a contribution to the literature of Positivism or not.

G. C. M.

There are good points in the *Manual of French Composition* (Cambridge University Press, 1914) for which Dr R. L. Græme Ritchie and Mr James M. Moore are responsible. The concluding 'model translations,' supplied by professors of English in French universities, are a new and valuable addition to books of this type, and the lists of synonyms and homonyms will be found useful. Unluckily these lists 'deal exclusively with words occurring in the exercises,' and hence perhaps the omission of such a word as *timbre* which should follow *cloche*, *clochette*, *grelot* and *sonnette* (p. 18); so, too, with respect to *le petit jour* and *la pointe du jour* which might well have been included on p. 19. Nor are we satisfied with the rendering of 'gentleman' by *un galant homme* (p. 20), an obsolescent expression which might be advantageously replaced by *un homme comme il faut*. Is it really necessary to inform students (p. 34) that 'the relative is never omitted in French,' and to add the illustration: 'The man I saw = *L'homme que j'ai vu*'? We have noted other superfluities, but it would be unfair to dwell further on the defects of a conscientious and useful compilation.

English students of Italian should be grateful to Mr Alfred Hoare for providing them with *An Italian Dictionary* (Cambridge University Press, 1915) of genuine scientific value. The accentuation is fully indicated; idiomatic expressions, proverbs and the like, are clearly explained; quotations from standard authors are furnished in abundance; and much pains have obviously been taken with the etymologies, for which Petrocchi, Rigutini and Fanfane (among other authorities) have been laid under contribution. In a volume of this size, some slips are inevitable: the equivalent of *barbottare* is rather 'to grumble' than 'to stammer'; that hard-worked adjective *prepotente* is better rendered by 'arrogant' or 'insolent' than by 'powerful'; and 'police' is a very tame substitute for *sbirraglia*. An unpretentious English-Italian vocabulary is added in the form of an appendix (pp. iii—cxxxv), and completes a work which can be warmly praised.

P. R.

CORRECTION.—In the review of *The Battle of the Seven Arts*, edited by L. J. Paetow, The 'University of Columbia' Press is erroneously stated (p. 245, last line) to be the publisher of the work; this should be 'University of California' Press.

George Campbell Macaulay.

At the moment of going to press we regret to learn of the death after a brief illness of Mr G. C. Macaulay who for the past five years has been editor of the English section of the *Review*. His death which took place at his home at Great Shelford near Cambridge on July 6th robs the world of an accomplished, many-sided, and fastidious scholar and an English gentleman of the bravest breed, who, if he had not been known as a scholar, would have been remembered as an athlete.

He was the eldest son of the Rev. S. H. Macaulay, Rector of Hodnet, Shropshire (a cousin of Lord Macaulay) and was born on August 6th, 1852. He passed from Eton to Trinity College, Cambridge, of which, after being bracketed Fourth Classic in 1876, he was elected a Fellow. In 1878 he vacated his fellowship by marriage and became an assistant master at Rugby. From 1887 to 1901 he made his home at first in Italy, and later in Oxford. From 1901 to 1906 he was Professor of English Language and Literature at Aberystwith and from 1906 to his death Lecturer in English in the University of Cambridge.

Macaulay's chief published work was his edition of the Latin, French and English works of John Gower (4 vols.): the French work 'Mirour de L'Omme' he had himself discovered in the University Library, Cambridge; of the English 'Confessio Amantis' he gave for the first time a satisfactory text. At an earlier date he had made a critical study of Francis Beaumont. He edited Thomson's works, wrote the life of him in the 'Men of Letters' series, translated Herodotus with new light got from the Medicean MS., edited the Globe text of Froissart's Chronicles and contributed chapters to the *Cambridge History of English Literature* on Gower and on Beaumont and Fletcher. Latterly, as readers of this review know, he was occupied with the elucidation of problems connected with the *Ancren Riwle*, and on this quest he visited the Bodleian within the last fortnight of his life. His reviews of books in these pages were always masterly, and other reviewers have owed much to the soundness and fine scholarship of his editorial criticisms.

No one who knew Macaulay could fail to feel his singular charm: a few would also feel the strength of his family affections, only half-concealed by a manly reserve. He was proud of the literary successes won by his daughter, Miss Rose Macaulay: he deeply felt the tragic death of a gallant son in India six years ago: and the present war, which called his surviving son to the front, brought him fresh anxieties. But hope and courage never failed him: as has been said 'he retained through life the enthusiasm, the simplicity, and directness of a child.'

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LITERATURE AND PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MACAULAY

AND

J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY

VOLUMES I—X

GENERAL INDEX

Cambridge:

at the University Press

1915

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100 PRINCES STREET

Paris: LIBRAIRIE HACHETTE ET CIE.
Chicago: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CONTRIBUTORS	5
SUBJECT INDEX	21
ETYMOLOGIES	45
BOOKS REVIEWED	49

CONTRIBUTORS

Adams, Joseph Quincy, Notes on Ben Jonson, from a Seventeenth Century Common-Place Book . . . . . VII, 296
Alden, Raymond Macdonald, The Mental Side of Metrical Form . IX, 297
—— Two exits in 'Othello' . . . . . X, 375
—— *Review* . . . . . X, 231
Alexander, Henry, The Genitive Suffix in the First Element of English Place-Names . . . . . VII, 64
—— *Review* . . . . . IX, 427
Allen, Hope Emily, A Note on Tennyson's 'Morte d'Arthur' . . VII, 99
Armstrong, E., Dante in Relation to the Sports and Pastimes of his Age . . . . . I, 173, 302
Atkins, J. W. H., *Reviews* . V, 377; VII, 251, 253, 396; IX, 113, 131; X, 237
Audra, E. and Kastner, L. E., Some Unpublished Poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden MSS. . . . . VII, 300

Baker, A. T., An Anglo-French Life of Saint Osith . . VI, 476; VII, 74, 157
—— An Anglo-French Life of Saint Paul the Hermit . . . IV, 491
—— Fragment of an Anglo-Norman Life of Edward the Confessor . III, 374
—— *Reviews* . . . . . IV, 428, 542
Baldensperger, F., Thomas Moore et A. de Vigny . . . . I, 290
—— Two Unpublished Letters to Goethe from an English Translator of 'Goetz von Berlichingen' . . . . . IV, 515
—— and Carré, J. M., La première Histoire indienne de Chateaubriand et sa source américaine . . . . . VIII, 15
Bang, W., 'Memorandums of the Immortal Ben' . . . . . I, 111
Barbier, A., *Reviews* . . . . . VII, 406, 407; X, 242, 244
Barbier, Paul, fils, Deux Noms de Poissons . . . . . IX, 190
—— Étymologie et Dérivés romans du lat. 'Acernia,' 'Acerna' . VIII, 185
—— Les Noms romans de l''Oblata melanurus' Cuv. . . . VII, 441
—— *Review* . . . . . IX, 117
Barnouw, A. J., Chaucer's 'Milleres Tale' . . . . . VII, 145
—— Goldsmith's Indebtedness to Justus van Effen . . . VIII, 314
—— 'Headless Bears' . . . . . II, 350
Beatty, Arthur, Notes on the Supposed Dramatic Character of the 'Ludi' in the Great Wardrobe Accounts of Edward III. . . IV, 474
Belfour, A. O., *Reviews* . . . . . V, 531; VI, 531; VII, 266, 557
Bell, Alexander, Cynewulf and Cyneheard in Gaimar . . . . X, 42

Bell, Aubrey F. G., The 'Cantigas de Santa Maria' of Alfonso X. . x, 338
—— Two Passages in the 'Cancioneiro da Vaticana' . . . x, 93
—— *Reviews* . . . . . ix, 418, 419, 553, 554; x, 119
Bensly, Edward, A Forgotten English Translation of Barclay's 'Argenis' iv, 392
—— Gray and Muretus . . . . . v, 345
—— A Note on Bishop Hall's Satires, 'Virgidemiae,' v, i, 65–72 . iii, 169
—— Pope's 'Rape of the Lock' . . . . . vii, 94
—— Pope's 'Windsor Forest,' ll. 65, 66 . . . . . vii, 97
—— The Title of Burton's 'Anatomy of Melancholy' . . . iv, 233
Berdan, John M., Alexander Barclay, Poet and Preacher . . . viii, 289
—— Wyatt and the French Sonneteers . . . . . iv, 240
Berthon, H. E., 'Mettre au rancart' . . . . . vii, 101
—— Suckling and Desportes . . . . . vi, 221
—— *Reviews* . . . . . v, 248; vii, 269
Block, K. S., Some Notes on the Problem of the 'Ludus Coventriae' x, 47
Boas, F. S., A Herrick Reading . . . . . viii, 92
—— John Lyly and the Oxford Stage . . . . . vi, 92
—— 'Macbeth' and 'Lingua' . . . . . iv, 517
—— *Reviews* . . . . i, 235; ii, 353; v, 510; vii, 110, 381; ix, 530
Bond, R. Warwick, *Review* . . . . . v, 361
Bradley, A. C., The Locality of 'King Lear,' Act i, sc. ii . . . iv, 238
—— Notes on Passages in Shelley . . . . . i, 25
—— Notes on Shelley's 'Triumph of Life' . . . . . ix, 441
Bradley, Henry, The Authorship of 'Piers the Plowman' . . . v, 202
—— The name of the Letter 'ȝ' . . . . . vii, 520
—— Some Cruces in 'Piers Plowman' . . . . . v, 340
—— Some Textual Puzzles in Greene's Works . . . . i, 208
—— Textual Notes on 'The Enterlude of Johan the Evangelist' . ii, 350
—— Two Riddles of the Exeter Book . . . . . vi, 433
—— Who was John But? . . . . . viii, 88
—— The word 'Moillere' in 'Piers the Plowman' . . . . ii, 163
—— *Review* . . . . . ii, 365
Brandin, Louis, 'Aucassin et Nicolete,' xxi, 5–8 . . . . . vi, 100
—— 'Vie de St Alexis,' Strophe cxi, 2 . . . . . vi, 98
—— *Reviews* . . . . i, 253, 356; ii, 375, 376; iii, 298, 302; x, 118
Brereton, J. Le Gay, Marlowe: Some Textual Notes . . . . vi, 94
—— Notes on 'A Knack to Know an Honest Man' . . . vii, 236
—— Notes on 'The Faire Maide of Bristow' . . . . . iii, 73
—— Notes on the Text of Chapman's Plays . . . . . iii, 56
—— The Relation of 'The Thracian Wonder' to Greene's 'Menaphon' ii, 34
—— Stage-Arrangement in Peele's 'David and Bethsabe,' Act i, sc. i vii, 373
—— *Review* . . . . . iii, 396
Brett, Cyril, Notes on 'Cleanness' and 'Sir Gawayne' . . . x, 188
—— Notes on 'Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight' . . . viii, 160
Brett-Smith, H. F. B., 'Ahrimanes,' by Thomas Love Peacock . . iv, 521
—— A Crux in the Text of Donne . . . . . x, 86
Breul, K., *Review* . . . . . ii, 186

Brooke, C. F. Tucker, 'Gentleness and Nobility': the Authorship and Source . . . . . VI, 458
Brooke, Rupert, The Authorship of the Later 'Appius and Virginia' VIII, 433
—— *Review* . . . . . VI, 257
Brown, Carleton, Lydgate's Verses on Queen Margaret's Entry into London . . . . . VII, 225
—— *Review* . . . . . VIII, 215
Bruce, J. Douglas, Two Notes on 'The Merry Wives of Windsor' . VII, 239
Buchanan, Milton A., Short Stories and Anecdotes in Spanish Plays IV, 178; V, 78
—— *Reviews* . . . . . IV, 551; IX, 556
Burne, J., *Review* . . . . . II, 86
Butler, A. J., Dante, 'De Vulgari Eloquentia,' I, vii . . III, 375; IV, 237
—— *Review* . . . . . II, 256

Capell, Agnes M., and Körner, Margaret A., The Relation of Grillparzer's 'König Ottokar' to M. von Collin's 'Friedrich der Streitbare' . . V, 464
Carpenter, J. C., The Abbé Prevost and Shakespeare . . . . X, 196
Carré, J. M., Two Unpublished Poems of W. S. Landor . . . VII, 375
—— and Baldensperger, F., La première Histoire indienne de Chateaubriand et sa source américaine . . . . . VIII, 15
Chambers, E. K., Ben Jonson and 'The Isle of Dogs' . . . IV, 511
—— Court Performances before Queen Elizabeth . . . . II, 1
—— Court Performances under James the First . . . . IV, 153
—— The Date of Fletcher's 'The Chances' . . . . IV, 512; V, 210
—— John Donne, Diplomatist and Soldier . . . . V, 492; VI, 397
—— Henry Evans and the Blackfriars . . . . . VIII, 90
—— 'Merry Wives of Windsor,' Act I, sc. iii, 93 . . . . IV, 88
—— Nathaniel Field and Joseph Taylor . . . . . IV, 395
—— William Kempe . . . . . IV, 88
—— *Reviews* . . . . II, 85; IV, 407; V, 224; VIII, 121; IX, 269
—— and Sidgwick, F., Fifteenth Century Carols by John Audelay V, 473; VI, 68
Chambers, R. W., The Authorship of 'Piers Plowman' . . . V, 1
—— 'Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight,' ll. 697–702 . . . II, 167
—— The Mythical Ancestor of the Kings of East Anglia . . IV, 508
—— The Original Form of the A-Text of 'Piers Plowman' . . VI, 302
—— The 'Shifted Leaf' in 'Beowulf' . . . . . X, 37
—— *Reviews* . . . I, 252; II, 190; IV, 262; VII, 546, 547; IX, 271
—— and Grattan, J. H. G., The Text of 'Piers Plowman.' I. The A-Text . . . . . IV, 357
Champenois, J. J., A Visit to Paris in 1749 . . . . . IX, 514
—— *Reviews* . . . . . VI, 419; VII, 272; IX, 127
Chatelain, H., *Reviews* . . . . . VI, 556; VIII, 130, 132, 561
Chaytor, H. J., An Anglo-Norman Calendar . . . . . II, 211
—— Giraut de Bornelh: 'Los Apleitz' . . . . . I, 222
—— *Reviews* . . . . . I, 353; IV, 426, 427; VI, 549
Chicanot, E. L., The Polyglot Vernacular of the Canadian North-West X, 88
Clark, Ruth, Horace Walpole and Mariette . . . . . IX, 520

Clark, Ruth, Saint Évremond's 'Parallèle de Monsieur le Prince et de Monsieur de Turenne' . . . . . VIII, 374
—— Walpole and the 'Mémoires de Grammont' . . . . X, 58
Clarke, F. W., *Review* . . . . . VIII, 222
Classen, E., O.E. 'Nicras' ('Beowulf,' 422, 575, 845, 1427) . . . X, 85
—— On the Pronunciation of 'S' in Germanic . . . . VII, 314
Clouzot, H., *Review* . . . . . III, 403
Collinson, W. E., 'Der österreichische Plutarch' and 'Das Archiv für Historie' as Sources of Grillparzer's 'König Ottokar' . . . V, 454
—— The Irrational Negative in Concessive Sentences: A Study in Germanic Syntax . . . . . X, 349
—— Johannes des Wisen 'Marienlob' . . . . . VI, 503
Cook, Albert S., The Date of the Old English Inscription on the Brussels Cross . . . . . X, 157
—— Two Notes on Milton . . . . . II, 121
Cooke, Margaret W., *Review* . . . . . VI, 422
Coulton, G. G., Chaucer's Captivity . . . . . IV, 234
—— In Defence of 'Pearl' . . . . . II, 39
—— 'Piers Plowman,' One or Five . . . . . VII, 102, 372
Craigie, W. A., *Review* . . . . . V, 382
Crawford, J. P. Wickersham, The Date of Composition of Lope de Vega's Comedia 'La Arcadia' . . . . . III, 40
—— Notes on the 'Amphitrion' and 'Los Menemnos' of Juan de Timoneda . . . . . IX, 248
—— Notes on three Sonnets attributed to Francisco de Figueroa . II, 223
Crosland, Jessie, A German Version of the Thief-Legend . . . I, 55
—— Italian Courtesy Books . . . . . V, 502
—— The Satire in Heinrich Wittenweiler's 'Ring' . . . . III, 356
—— 'Von dem Blümlin Vergissmeinnit.' A Middle High German Poem . . . . . IX, 359
—— *Reviews* . . . . . II, 278, 369; IV, 537
Cunliffe, John W., Gascoigne and Shakspere . . . . . IV, 231
—— The Original 'Romeo and Juliet' . . . . . VII, 517
—— 'The Spoyle of Antwerpe' (1576) . . . . . VI, 88
Cunnington, R. H., The Revision of 'King Lear' . . . . . V, 445
Curtis, F. J., *Review* . . . . . II, 74

Darbishire, Helen, *Reviews* . . . . VI, 124, 520; VIII, 113, 548; X, 115
Deakin, Mary, The Alliteration of 'Piers Plowman' . . . . IV, 478
Derocquigny, J., E. 'Grouse,' F. 'Greuce'; E. 'Hatchment,' F. 'Hachement'; E. 'Junk' or 'Rush of the Sea,' F. 'Jonc marin'; E. 'Relent,' A. F. 'Relenter' . . . . . VIII, 93
—— Lexicographical Notes . . . . . I, 188
—— A Possible Source of Chaucer, 'Canterbury Tales,' A 4134 and D 415 III, 72
—— Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida,' Act III, sc. iii, 161–3 . III, 371
—— 'Wayte What'='Whatever' . . . . . III, 72
Dickins, Bruce, and Forbes, M. D., The Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses X, 28

Dodds, Madeleine H., The Problem of the 'Ludus Coventriae' . . IX, 79
Doren, Carl van, *Reviews* . . . . . VIII, 381; IX, 254
Dowden, E., A Pamphlet of Bishop Berkeley (hitherto undescribed) . I, 286
—— The Text of Gray's Poems . . . . . II, 165
—— *Review* . . . . . II, 182

Edmonston-Scott, W. J., *Review* . . . . . VIII, 272
Elton, O., *Reviews* . . . . . IV, 119; V, 114; IX, 389
Emerson, O. F., A Note on the M.E. 'Cleanness' . . . . X, 373
Evans, J., and Jourdain, E. F., A Note on an Allusion to Rome in the 'Divina Commedia' . . . . . IX, 381
Evans, M. Blakemore, *Review* . . . . . IV, 531

Fannière, Édouard, Charles Rivière Dufresny . . . . . VI, 335
—— *Review* . . . . . VIII, 253
Feuillerat, A., John Lyly's Relations by Marriage . . . . VI, 219
—— Performance of a Tragedy at New College, Oxford, in the Time of Queen Mary . . . . . IX, 96
—— An Unknown Protestant Morality Play . . . . . IX, 94
—— *Review* . . . . . I, 330
Fiedler, H. G., 'Earth upon Earth' . . . . . III, 218
Fischer, Walther, Somaize and Sorel . . . . . IX, 375
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., Espronceda . . . . . IV, 20
—— *Reviews* . . I, 64; II, 79, 82, 257, 258; IV, 258, 425, 432; VI, 278
Foligno, Cesare, An Italian Version of the Legend of Saint Margaret . VI, 23
—— *Reviews* VI, 415; VII, 132, 410, 422; VIII, 134, 267, 271, 563; IX, 429; X, 248
Forbes, M. D., and Dickins, Bruce, The Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses X, 28
Ford, Gertrude E., Note on a Line in Keats's 'Isabella' . . . VIII, 543
Fox, J. C., An Anglo-Norman Apocalypse from Shaftesbury Abbey . VIII, 338
—— The Earliest French Apocalypse and Commentary. . . VII, 445
Freund, Julius, Eine ältere Fassung der Petrarcaode von Carl Friedrich Cramer . . . . . VI, 192
—— Carl Friedrich Cramers zweite Petrarcaode . . . . VI, 374
—— The Sounds of West Middle German as spoken at Marburg an der Lahn . . . . . V, 90
—— Unbekannte Jugendgedichte von Carl Friedrich Cramer . VII, 351
Fynes-Clinton, O., *Review* . . . . . V, 253

Gardner, E. A., *Review* . . . . . VIII, 419
Gardner, Edmund G., Three Notes on the 'Divina Commedia' . . IX, 101
—— *Review* . . . . . VI, 547
Gohin, F., *Reviews* . . . . . II, 184; III, 86; IV, 269
Grattan, J. H. G., Minor Notes on 'Havelok the Dane' . . . IV, 91
—— On the Text of the Prose Portion of the 'Paris Psalter' . IV, 185
—— *Reviews* . . . . . II, 175, 190; III, 199, 303; IX, 403
—— and Chambers, R. W., The Text of 'Piers Plowman.' I. The A-Text . . . . . IV, 357

Graves, T. S., A Neglected Work of Pre-Restoration Criticism . . x, 377
—— A Tragedy of Dido and Aeneas acted in 1607 . . . ix, 525
Gray, Henry David, The First Quarto 'Hamlet' . . . . . x, 171
Greg, W. W., The Authorship of the Songs in Lyly's Plays . . i, 43
—— Autograph Plays by Anthony Munday . . . . . viii, 89
—— A Ballad of Twelfth Day . . . . . viii, 64; ix, 235
—— Chaucer Attributions in MS. Trin. Coll. Cambridge R. 319 . viii, 539
—— Drayton's Sonnets . . . . . ii, 164
—— The 'Hamlet' Quartos, 1603, 1604 . . . . . v, 196
—— Jonson's 'Staple of News' . . . . . i, 327
—— The Troubles of a Norman Scribe . . . . . v, 282
—— *Reviews* i, 136, 238, 337, 356; ii, 73, 83, 189, 364, 373, 374; iii, 292, 293, 396; iv, 115, 118, 130, 268, 413, 415; v, 211, 356, 394, 515; vi, 528, 529, 559; ix 259
Grierson, H. J. C., The Authorship of 'Absence, hear thou my protestation' . . . . . vi, 383
—— Bacon's Poem 'The World': its Date and Relation to certain other Poems . . . . . vi, 145
—— Donniana . . . . . ix, 237
—— A Note on the Text of 'As You Like It,' Act ii, sc. i, 5 . ix, 370
—— 'Underneath this sable hearse' etc. . . . . vi, 517
—— *Review* . . . . . iv, 110
Guthkelch, A. C., Swift's 'Tale of a Tub' . . viii, 301, 454; ix, 100; x, 181
—— *Review* . . . . . x, 232

Hadow, Grace E., *Reviews* v, 376, 529, 530; vi, 259, 530; vii, 556; viii, 133, 213, 227, 558; ix, 115, 398, 540
Hall, Theophilus D., Was 'Langland' the Author of the C-Text of 'The Vision of Piers Plowman'? . . . . . iv, 1
Hamelius, P., The Source of Southerne's 'Fatal Marriage' . . . iv, 352
Harper, Carrie A., 'Locrine' and 'The Faerie Queene' . . . viii, 369
Hatcher, O. L., *Reviews* . . . . . vi, 118; x, 228, 382
Hatfield, J. T., Newly-Discovered Political Poems by Wilhelm Müller i, 212
Heberden, C. B., Dante's Lyrical Metres: his Theory and Practice . iii, 313
Heller, Otto, Bibliographical Notes on Charles Sealsfield . . . iii, 360
Henderson, T. F., *Review* . . . . . viii, 115
Hepple, N., *Reviews* . . . . . viii, 389; ix, 536
Herford, C. H., Ben Jonson and the Cardinal Duperron . . . iv, 81
—— *Reviews* . . . . . i, 128; ii, 179; viii, 210; x, 234, 381
Hohlfeld, A. R., *Review* . . . . . iii, 379
Holl, Karl, Sheridan's 'Verses to the Memory of Garrick' and Schiller's 'Prolog zum Wallenstein' . . . . . ix, 246
—— *Review* . . . . . vii, 416
Holme, James W., Italian Courtesy-Books of the Sixteenth Century . v, 145
Hooper, Edith S., The Authorship of 'Luminalia' and Notes on some other Poems of Sir William D'Avenant . . . . . viii, 540
Huchon, R., *Review* . . . . . ii, 266
Hughes, A. M. D., Shelley's 'Witch of Atlas' . . . . . vii, 508

Hughes, A. M. D., Shelley's 'Zastrozzi' and 'St Irvyne' . . . VII, 54
—— *Review* . . . . . VII, 383
Hunter, Mark, Notes on the 'Interlude of Wealth and Health' . . III, 366
—— A Note on 'King Lear' . . . . . IV, 84
Hutton, W. H., The Influence of Dante in Spanish Literature . . III, 105

Jack, A. A., *Review* . . . . . VIII, 235
Jackson, Henry, 'Bozzimacu' . . . . . VI, 96
Jackson, W. W., On the Interpretation of 'Pareglio' in Dante . . I, 116
James, M. R., and Macaulay, G. C., Fifteenth Century Carols and other Pieces . . . . . VIII, 68
Jones, P. M., Whitman in France . . . . . X, 1
Jones, W. Lewis, *Reviews* . . . . IV, 106; V, 221; VII, 555; VIII, 109
Jourdain, E. F., Holyday's 'Survey of the World' and the 'Dittamondo' II, 44
—— 'La Journée des Dupes' . . . . . IX, 516
—— and Evans, J., Note on an Allusion to Rome in the 'Divina Commedia' . . . . . IX, 381
Jusserand, J. J., Ambassador La Boderie and the 'Compositeur' of the Byron Plays . . . . . VI, 203

Kastner, L. E., On Certain Poems of the Hawthornden MSS. . . VII, 98
—— Drummond of Hawthornden and the French Poets of the Sixteenth Century . . . . . V, 40
—— Drummond of Hawthornden and the Poets of the Pléiade . . IV, 329
—— Drummond's Indebtedness to Sidney . . . . . VI, 157
—— The Elizabethan Sonneteers and the French Poets . . III, 268
—— Georg Rudolf Weckherlin's Models . . . . . X, 366
—— The Italian Sources of Daniel's 'Delia' . . . . . VII, 153
—— On the Italian and French Sources of Drummond of Hawthornden VI, 462
—— The Scottish Sonneteers and the French Poets . . . III, 1
—— Some Old French Poems on the Antichrist . . . I, 269; II, 26
—— Some Unpublished Poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden MSS. . . . . VI, 324; VII, 300
—— Spenser's 'Amoretti' and Desportes . . . . . IV, 65
—— Suckling and Desportes . . . . . V, 497; VI, 223
—— Thomas Lodge as an Imitator of the Italian Poets . . II, 155
—— Wyatt and the French Sonneteers . . . . . IV, 249
—— *Reviews* . . . . . IV, 549; V, 261; VI, 246
—— and Audra, E., Some Unpublished Poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden MSS. . . . . VII, 300
Keller, Wolfgang, *Review* . . . . . III, 177
Kemp-Welch, Alice, Dante and the 'Mahabharata' . . . . VII, 243
Kenwood, Sydney H., Lessing in England . . . . . IX, 197, 344
Ker, W. P., The Craven Angels . . . . . VI, 85
—— Dante, Guido Guinicelli and Arnaut Daniel . . . . IV, 145
—— An Icelandic Proverb ('Thin End of the Wedge') . . . V, 348
—— *Reviews* . . . . II, 176; III, 395; V, 507; VII, 127; VIII, 264, 395

Körner, Margaret A., Two Poems attributed to Theodor Körner . VIII, 53
—— and Capell, Agnes M., The Relation of Grillparzer's 'König Ottokar' to M. von Collin's 'Friedrich der Streitbare' . . . V, 464
Koszul, A., Notes and Corrections to Shelley's 'History of a Six Weeks' Tour' (1817) . . . . . II, 61

Lafleur, Paul T., Sainte-Beuve, Balzac, and Thackeray. . . . IX, 517
Lancaster, H. Carrington, Two Unnoticed Poems probably written by Pierre Corneille . . . . . X, 226
Law, Robert Adger, Yarington's 'Two Lamentable Tragedies' . . V, 167
Lawrence, John, Authorities on English Pronunciation . . . IX, 53
—— The O.E. Name for the Letter 'G' . . . . . VIII, 206
Lawrence, W. J., 'Epithalamium upon Lady Mary Cromwell's Marriage' IX, 374
—— 'Soliman and Perseda' . . . . . IX, 523
Lees, John, *Reviews* . . . . . I, 152; VIII, 560; IX, 426
Lewenz, Marie A., West Germanic 'I' in Old English Saxon Dialects III, 278
Linton, K. M., and T. B. Rudmose-Brown, *Review* . . . . IX, 122
Littledale, H., 'A Headless Bear' . . . . . I, 232; II, 63
—— 'Deep Pathaires' ('Arden of Feversham,' Act III, sc. v, 51) . I, 233
—— The Mad Songs in 'The Two Noble Kinsmen' . . . V, 200
—— A Note on Spenser's 'Amoretti' . . . . . VI, 203
—— Was 'Due Desert' Walter Devereux? . . . . . IV, 510
—— *Review* . . . . . I, 133
Livingstone, Arthur, Concerning an Aspect of Concettismo . . . VIII, 331
Logeman, H., 'To set spell on end' . . . . . I, 325
Long, Percy W., 'Backare' . . . . . VIII, 373
—— Spenser and Lady Carey . . . . . III, 257
—— Spenser's 'Muiopotmos' . . . . . IX, 457
—— Spenser's Sonnets 'as published' . . . . . VI, 390
—— *Review*. . . . . IV, 529
Loomis, Roger S., A Sidelight on the 'Tristan' of Thomas . . X, 304
Löwenstein, Agnes, The Sources of Hebbel's 'Agnes Bernauer' IV, 302; VII, 330
Lowes, John L., The Chaucerian 'Merciles Beaute' and three Poems of Deschamps . . . . . V, 33
—— Chaucer's Friday . . . . . IX, 94
—— 'L'Allegro' and 'The Passionate Shepheard' . . . . VI, 206
Lummis, E. W., *Review* . . . . . VIII, 220

Macaulay, G. C., The 'Ancren Riwle' . . . . . IX, 63, 145, 324, 463
—— 'A Dry Beating' . . . . . X, 224
—— The Date of Fletcher's 'The Chances' . . . . . V, 112
—— The Name of the Author of 'Piers Plowman' . . . V, 195
—— Notes on Chaucer . . . . . IV, 14
—— Richardson and his French Predecessors . . . . . VIII, 464
—— Shakespeare, 'Romeo and Juliet,' Act II, sc. ii, 38 ff. . . X, 223
—— *Reviews* I, 145; II, 177; IV, 418, 525, 526; V, 227, 233, 246, 357, 370, 375, 395, 521, 527; VI, 114, 136, 137, 253, 532, 533, 558; VII, 114, 135, 248, 262, 279, 391,

423, 542, 553, 559, 567; VIII, 133, 223, 229, 274, 396, 553; IX, 111; X, 111, 112, 390
Macaulay, G. C. and James, M. R., Fifteenth Century Carols and other Pieces . . . . . VIII, 68
MacCracken, H. N., Lydgate's 'Serpent of Division' . . . . . VIII, 103
McKerrow, R. B., Notes on 'The Devil's Charter' by Barnabe Barnes . I, 126
—— *Reviews* . . . . . II, 65; VII, 548
McLaughlin, W. A., An Episode in Victor Hugo's 'Notre Dame de Paris' IX, 246
Maclean, Christina M., Victor Hugo's Use of Chamberlayne's 'L'État présent de l'Angleterre' in 'L'Homme qui rit' . . . . . VIII, 496
—— Victor Hugo's Use of 'Les Délices de la Grande Bretagne' in 'L'Homme qui rit' . . . . . VIII, 173
Martin, L. C., Crashaw's Translation of Marino's 'La Strage degli Innocenti' ('Sospetto d' Herode') . . . . . X, 378
Mawer, Allen, 'Merril's Bridge' . . . . . X, 84
—— *Reviews* I, 234, 342; IV, 132, 272, 273, 420, 431; V, 244, 261, 380, 381, 396; VI, 131, 276, 277, 542; VII, 126, 134, 264; VIII, 118, 133, 207, 242, 246, 422, 423; IX, 105, 133; X, 106, 385
Mayhew, A. L., On Some Etymologies of English Words . . VII, 318, 499
Maynadier, Howard, The Areopagus of Sidney and Spenser . . IV, 289
Meisnest, F. W., Wieland's Translation of Shakespeare . . . IX, 12
Meyer, R. M., *Reviews* . . . . . I, 154, 348; IV, 548
Mitchell, John T., *Reviews* . . . . . VIII, 566; IX, 423
Montgomery, Marshall, Hölderlin and 'Diotima' . . . . . VII, 193
Moore, E., The Almanac of 'Jacob ben Machir ben Tibbon' . . III, 376
—— The 'Battifolle' Letters sometimes attributed to Dante . IX, 173
—— Two Proposed Emendations in Dante's Epistola VI, § 6 . V, 337
Moore, Samuel, The Old English 'Genesis,' ll. 1145 and 1446–8 . VI, 199
—— The Prologue to Chaucer's 'Legend of Good Women' in Relation to Queen Anne and Richard . . . . . VII, 488
Moorman, F. W., A Herrick Reading . . . . . VII, 519
—— The Pre-Shakespearean Ghost . . . . . I, 85
—— Shakespeare's Ghosts . . . . . I, 192
—— *Reviews* . . I, 69; II, 191; V, 119; VI, 121, 123, 536, 558; IX, 110
Morfill, W. R., *Reviews* . . . . . I, 259; II, 189, 193
Morgan, Louise B., Some Academic Grammar Plays . . . . V, 199
Mutschmann, H., 'Bozzimacu' . . . . . VI, 96
—— An Unpublished Letter from Ottilie von Goethe to A. Hayward VIII, 377
—— *Reviews* . . . . . VI, 273, 274; VIII, 257; IX, 273

Napier, Arthur S., The 'Ancren Riwle' . . . . . IV, 433
—— The Old English 'Exodus' ll. 63—134 . . . . . VI, 165
—— Two Fragments of Alfred's 'Orosius' . . . . . VIII, 59
Northup, Clark S., A Critique by Horace Walpole . . . . VI, 387
Northup, George T., 'El Dómine Lucas' of Lope de Vega and some related Plays . . . . . IV, 462
Noyes, G. R., *Review* . . . . . VII, 117

Oelsner, H., *Reviews* I, 258, 351, 352; VI, 135, 279, 280; VIII, 126, 275, 277, 423
Oliphant, E. H. C., Shakspere's Plays: an Examination . III, 337; IV, 190, 342
Omond, T. S., Milton and Syllabism . . . . . IV, 93
—— Milton's Heroic Line . . . . . V, 112
—— Syllables in Verse and Speech . . . . . V, 205
—— *Reviews* . . . . . VI, 539; VII, 257; VIII, 240
Onions, C. Talbut, 'Bozzimacu,' 'Esbat' . . . . . V, 500
—— 'To have one's raik' . . . . . IV, 507
—— 'Merry Greek' . . . . . I, 231
—— Middle English 'Coveise' . . . . . III, 171
—— Some Early Middle English Spellings . . . . . IV, 505
—— 'Speak within door' ('Othello,' Act IV, sc. ii, 144) . . V, 501
—— A Thirteenth-Century Paternoster by an Anglo-French Scribe . III, 69
—— An Unrecorded Reading in 'Piers Plowman' . . . . III, 170

Parrott, T. M., The 'Academic Tragedy' of 'Caesar and Pompey' . . V, 435
—— The Date of Chapman's 'Bussy d'Ambois' . . . . III, 126
—— The Text of Chapman's 'Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron' . . . . . IV, 40
—— *Review* . . . . . VI, 398
Parry, G. A., *Reviews* . . . . . I, 160; IV, 544
Partridge, A. Joanna, Shakespeare's 'All's Well,' Act IV, sc. v, 14–22 VI, 383
—— Shakespeare's 'Antony and Cleopatra,' Act III, sc. xiii, 158–167 III, 372
Patterson, R. F., 'Paindemaine' . . . . . VII, 376
Paues, Anna C., The Name of the Letter 'ȝ' . . . . . VI, 441
—— *Review* . . . . . IX, 410
Petsch, Robert, A Jest of Goldoni's in Goethe's 'Faust' . . . VII, 100
—— *Reviews* . . . . . VII, 413, 538; VIII, 413; IX, 560
Platt, Arthur, 'Edward III' and Shakespeare's Sonnets . . . VI, 511
Pope, Mildred K., Four Chansons de Geste: A Study in Old French Epic Versification . . . . . VIII, 352; IX, 41; X, 310
—— A Note on the Dialect of Béroul's 'Tristan' and a Conjecture . . . . . VIII, 189
—— The 'Tractatus Orthographiae' of T. H., Parisii Studentis . V, 185
—— *Reviews* . . . . . VIII, 248; IX, 278
Pound, Louise, Indefinite Composites and Word-Coinage . . . VIII, 324
Prestage, Edgar, *Review* . . . . . III, 88
Priebsch, J., Zwei altfranzösische Mariengebete . . . . IV, 70, 200
Priebsch, Robert, Deutsche Prosafragmente des XII. Jahrhunderts, I . X, 203
—— Ein historisches Lied vom Schmalkaldischen Krieg . . VI, 183
—— Eine mittelniederländische Mystiker-Handschrift . . . V, 178
—— Ein neues Bruchstück aus der 'Rose' Heinrics van Aken . VI, 371
—— Quelle und Abfassungszeit der Sonntagsepistel in der irischen 'Cáin Domnaig' . . . . . II, 138
—— Ein unbekannter Brief Christian Brentanos an Henry Crabb Robinson . . . . . VIII, 533
—— *Reviews* . . . . . I, 66; III, 189; IV, 128; VII, 277

Quiggin, E. C., *Reviews* . . . . . II, 374; IX, 281

Ragg, Lonsdale, Dante and the 'Gospel of Barnabas' . . . . III, 157
—— Wit and Humour in Dante . . . . . VIII, 27
—— *Reviews* I, 73, 158, 255, 256, 351, 355; II, 191, 253; III, 182, 198, 303, 407, 408; IV, 131, 274, 552; V, 262, 394, 534; VI, 134; VII, 565
Rea, T., *Review* . . . . . II, 372
Rennert, H. A., Notes on the Chronology of the Spanish Drama . II, 331; III, 43
—— Notes on Some Comedias of Lope de Vega . . . . I, 96
—— *Reviews* . . . . . II, 168; IV, 422; IX, 275, 421
Roberts, W. Wright, Chateaubriand and Milton . . . . . V, 409
Robertson, J. G., Friedrich Hebbel . . . . . VIII, 145
—— R. P. Gillies and Goethe . . . . . IV, 89
—— The Knowledge of Shakspeare on the Continent at the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century . . . . . I, 312
—— Lessing and Farquhar . . . . . II, 56
—— Lessing and Marmontel . . . . . VI, 216
—— 'Nathan der Weise,' Act I, sc. ii . . . . . VIII, 203
—— Notes on Lessing's 'Beyträge zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters' . . . . . VIII, 511; IX, 213
—— Sören Kierkegaard . . . . . IX, 500
—— *Reviews* I, 150, 349; II, 192, 273, 376, 377; III, 195, 301, 401, 408; IV, 275; VII, 414; VIII, 276, 405, 407; IX, 280, 424
Robertson, J. M., The Authorship of 'Titus Andronicus' . . . II, 63
Robin, P. Ansell, Spenser's 'House of Alma' . . . . . VI, 169
Rooker, T. K., The Optimism of Alfred de Vigny . . . . IX, 1
Routh, H. V., The Future of Comparative Literature . . . . VIII, 1
—— *Reviews* . . . . . VI, 241; VII, 561
Royster, James F., English Tags in Matthew of Paris . . . IV, 509
Rudmose-Brown, T. B., English and French Metric . . VIII, 104; X, 102
—— *Reviews* . II, 261; III, 181; VI, 230; VII, 130; VIII, 420; IX, 122, 549

Sandbach, F. E., *Reviews* . . . . . II, 277; VII, 540; X, 255
Saunders, W., *Review* . . . . . III, 94
Sayle, Charles, *Review* . . . . . VII, 545
Schaaffs, G., Bruchstücke einer mittelniederdeutschen Beichte nach den Abschnitten des Katechismus . . . . . II, 342
—— Gotisch 'Bijandzuþ þan' ('Philemon,' 22) . . . . I, 328
—— Schröders Ausschreiben und die drei Brudermorddramen . VI, 9
—— Zwei Friederikenlieder . . . . . VII, 469
—— *Reviews* . . . . . V, 128, 388
Schelling, F. E., *Reviews* . . . . . VI, 406; VII, 105
Sedgefield, W. E., Notes on 'Beowulf' . . . . . V, 286
—— The Place-Name 'Hale,' 'Haile,' 'Haugh,' 'Eale' . . . IX, 240
—— *Reviews* VI, 128; VII, 123, 135; VIII, 243, 394, 416, 550; IX, 405, 409; X, 238, 387
Sélincourt, E. de, *Review* . . . . . VIII, 546

Shaw, J. E., Dante's 'Gentile Donna' . . . . . x, 129, 320
Shearin, Hubert G., Kentucky Folk-Songs . . . . . vi, 513
—— *Review* . . . . . iii, 392
Sidgwick, F., *Reviews* . . . . . i, 72; iii, 294, 295; vi, 260
—— and Chambers, E. K., Fifteenth Century Carols by John Audelay . . . . . v, 473; vi, 68
Simpson, P., An Allusion in Webster . . . . . ii, 162
—— The Authorship and Original Issue of 'Cinthia's Revenge' . ii, 348
—— 'Deep Pathaires' ('Arden of Feversham,' Act iii, sc. v, 51) . i, 326
—— 'Tanquam Explorator': Jonson's Method in the 'Discoveries' ii, 201
—— *Review* . . . . . i, 251
Skeat, Walter W., Chaucer: 'The Shipman's Prologue' . . . v, 430
—— The Chaucerian 'Merciles Beaute' . . . . . v, 194
—— 'Elegy on the Death of King Edward I.' From a new Manuscript vii, 149
—— The Etymology of 'Dismal' . . . . . vi, 210
—— Fragment of a Middle English Poem . . . . . v, 104
—— A New 'Havelok' ms. . . . . vi, 455
—— Provençal Words in English . . . . . i, 283; ii, 60
—— 'To Prune' . . . . . vi, 97
—— Shakespeare, 'King Lear,' Act iv, sc. vi, 70—72 . . . vi, 209
—— Shakespeare, 'Measure for Measure,' Act ii, sc. i, 39 . . v, 197
—— *Reviews* . . . . . v, 120, 241; vi, 412, 543
Skemp, A. R., The Old English Charms . . . . . vi, 289
—— *Reviews* . . . . . vi, 262; vii, 379; ix, 400; x, 109, 236
Smart, J. S., Milton in Rome . . . . . viii, 91
Smith, G. C. Moore, The Cambridge Play 'Laelia' . . . . vi, 382
—— Charles Lamb, 'Essays of Elia' . . . . . iii, 74
—— Donniana . . . . . viii, 47
—— Herrick's 'Hesperides' . . . . . ix, 373
—— 'Jacke Jugeler,' ll. 256—259 . . . . . x, 375
—— John Mason and Edward Sharpham . . . . . viii, 371
—— 'Joncy' . . . . . viii, 97
—— Latin Plays acted at Cambridge . . . . . vi, 87
—— Marlowe at Cambridge . . . . . iv, 167
—— Matthew Roydon . . . . . ix, 97
—— Milton, 'Samson Agonistes,' l. 373 . . . . . iii, 74
—— Notes on 'The Devil's Charter' by Barnabe Barnes . . i, 124
—— Notes on Some English University Plays . . . . iii, 141
—— The Omission of 'Have' before a Past Participle . . . v, 346
—— The Parnassus Plays . . . . . x, 162
—— Riche's Story 'Of Phylotus and Emilia' . . . . . v, 342
—— Seneca, Jonson, Daniel and Wordsworth . . . . i, 232
—— Shakespeareana . . . . . i, 53; ii, 347
—— Shakespeare's Sonnets li, ll. 10 f. . . . . ix, 372
—— Spenser, 'Shepherd's Calendar,' November . . . . ii, 346
—— Spenser and Mulcaster . . . . . viii, 368
—— Thackeray's 'Peg of Limavaddy' . . . . . x, 380

Smith, G. C. Moore, 'Victoria,' 'Exchange Ware,' and 'Worke for Cutlers' III, 373
—— *Reviews* I, 334; II, 72, 281, 361; III, 80; IV, 125, 130, 271; V, 222, 260, 520; VI, 414, 524, 538; VII, 249, 414, 550, 552; VIII, 218, 387, 392, 569; IX, 262, 394, 533; X, 127, 383, 385
Smith, G. Gregory, Some Notes on the Comparative Study of Literature I, 1
—— *Reviews* . . . . . I, 343; II, 358, 360
Smith, Herbert, An English Translation of Goethe's 'Clavigo' . . VIII, 204
—— Two English Translations of Schiller's 'Wallenstein' . . IX, 243
Smith, J. C., The Problems of Spenser's Sonnets . . . . V, 273
Smith, Minna Steele, *Review* . . . . . III, 287
Smith, W. F., Identification of Don Philipe des Marays, Viceroy de Papeligosse in 'Gargantua,' c. 15 . . . . . VIII, 199
—— Rabelais on Language by Signs . . . . . VIII, 193
Smythe, Barbara, The Connection between Words and Music in the Songs of the Trobadors . . . . . III, 329
—— *Review* . . . . . IV, 540
Spearing, Evelyn M., A Chronological Arrangement of Donne's Sermons VIII, 468
—— Donne's Sermons and their Relation to his Poetry . . VII, 40
—— The Elizabethan 'Tenne Tragedies of Seneca' . . . IV, 437
—— *Review* . . . . . VII, 246
Spingarn, J. E., Dryden's 'Parallel of Poetry and Painting' . . III, 75
Steeves, Harrison Ross, 'The Athenian Virtuosi' and 'The Athenian Society' . . . . . VII, 358
Steppat, J., *Reviews*. . . . . III, 299; VI, 272
Stewart, H. F., *Reviews* . . . . . IV, 546; VII, 387, 390
Studer, P., Étude sur quelques Vocables anglo-normands . . . VI, 174
—— *Review* . . . . . VII, 402
Swaen, A. E. H., The Date of Brewer's 'Love-Sick King' . . . IV, 87
—— Fielding and Goldsmith in Leyden . . . . . I, 327
—— Notes on 'The Devil's Charter' by Barnabe Barnes . I, 122; II, 167
—— Notes on 'The Two Noble Kinsmen' . . . . . VI, 205
—— The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus . . . . . X, 222
—— *Review* . . . . . III, 76

Tatlock, John S. P., The Welsh 'Troilus and Cressida' and its Relations to the Elizabethan Drama . . . . . X, 265
Terracher, A., Une Source possible de 'Salammbô' . . . . IX, 379
—— *Review* . . . . . IX, 416
Thomas, P. G., 'Beowulf' and 'Daniel' A . . . . . VIII, 537
—— Drummond and Browne . . . . . VII, 241
—— Notes on the Language of 'Beowulf' . . . . . I, 202
—— *Reviews* . . . . . II, 70; III, 297; VI, 266; VII, 268
Thomas, W., Milton's Heroic Line viewed from an Historical Standpoint II, 289; III, 16, 232; V, 107
Tilley, A., The Authorship of the 'Isle Sonnante' . . . . II, 14, 129
—— The Composition of the Pléiade . . . . . VI, 212
—— The Date of D'Urfé's 'L'Astrée' . . . . . VIII, 101

Tilley, A., Rabelais and Geographical Discovery . . II, 316; III, 209; V, 68
—— *Reviews* II, 182, 260, 261, 280; IV, 102, 131, 401; V, 126, 536; VI, 134; VII, 397, 536; VIII, 121, 398; IX, 284, 285, 412, 415, 543, 548
Tilley, M. P., The Etymology of 'Pun' . . . . . VI, 211
Toynbee, Paget, Boccaccio's Commentary on the 'Divina Commedia' . II, 97
—— The Centenary of the Completion of Cary's 'Dante' . . VII, 326
—— 'Connoissance' in the 'New English Dictionary' . . . II, 166
—— Dante's Letter to the Emperor Henry VII (Epist. VII): Critical Text . . . . . X, 64
—— Dante's Letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (Epist. V): Critical Text . . . . . X, 150
—— Dante's Remarks on Translation in the 'Convivio' . . VIII, 101
—— English Translations of Dante in the Eighteenth Century . I, 9
—— The Etymology of 'Buckram' . . . . . IX, 243
—— Gibbon and Dante . . . . . VI, 215, 518
—— The Inquisition and the 'Editio Princeps' of the 'Vita Nuova' III, 228
—— Jonathan Richardson and Portraits of Dante . . . . VIII, 202
—— The S. Pantaleo Italian Translation of Dante's Letter to the Emperor Henry VII (Epist. VII) . . . . . IX, 332
—— The S. Pantaleo Text of Dante's Letters to the Emperor Henry VII and to the Princes and Peoples of Italy . . . . VII, 208
—— The Sepulchres at Pola referred to by Dante . . . . IV, 390
—— The Vatican Text (Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat. 1729) of the Letters of Dante . . . . . VII, 1
—— The Venetian Text (Cod. Marc. Lat. XIV, 115) of Dante's Letter to the Emperor Henry VII . . . . . VII, 433
—— *Reviews* I, 155; III, 91; V, 122, 124, 257, 398; VI, 545; VII, 421; VIII, 262; IX, 134
Trenery, Grace R., Ballad Collections of the Eighteenth Century . X, 283
Triebel, L. A., Grillparzer and Kotzebue's 'Rudolph von Hapsburg und Ottokar von Böhmen' . . . . . V, 469
—— *Review* . . . . . X, 120
Trofimov, M. V., The Beginnings of Russian Literature . . . X, 73
Tuttle, Edwin H., Catalan Notes . . . . . X, 89
—— Hispanic 'alteru' and 'altu' . . . . . VII, 377
—— Hispanic 'Tomar' . . . . . VIII, 97
—— Italian 'x' . . . . . VIII, 100
—— Notes on Romanic Speech-History . . . . VIII, 484; IX, 493
—— Portuguese Spelling . . . . . VIII, 99
—— Roumanian 'Geană' . . . . . IX, 251
—— *Review* . . . . . X, 246

Vaughan, C. E., *Review* . . . . . VI, 225
Verrall, A. W., *Review* . . . . . VII, 255
Verrall, Margaret de G., Allusions in 'Adonais' to the Poems of Keats . VI, 354
—— A Possible Reminiscence of Plotinus in Tennyson . . . II, 327
Verrier, P., English and French Metric. . . . . VII, 522; IX, 385

Viëtor, W., The Association Phonétique Internationale . . . IX, 285
Viglione, F., Paolo Rolli and the Society for the Encouragement of Learning . . . . . VIII, 200

Waller, A. R., *Reviews* . . . . . I, 148; II, 77, 265; III, 85
Ward, Sir A. W., *Review*. . . . . V, 349
Ward, H. G., Richardson's Character of Lovelace. . . . . VII, 494
Warshaw, J., Somaize and Sorel . . . . . X, 95
Waters, E. G. R., *Review* . . . . . VIII, 251
Webster, A. Blyth, *Reviews* . . . . . II, 280; III, 173
Weekley, Ernest, 'To appoint' (Milton, 'Samson Agonistes,' l. 373) . III, 373
—— English 'ca(u)lk,' French 'calfater' . . . . . V, 498
—— English 'mullion,' French 'meneau' . . . . . IV, 396
—— Etymologies . . . . . VI, 471
—— The Etymology of 'roister' . . . . . VII, 518
Weeks, Raymond, The Boulogne Manuscript of the 'Chevalerie Vivien' V, 54
—— *Reviews* . . . . . I, 353; III, 82; IV, 431
Wells, John Edwin, 'A Luue Ron' and 'Of clene Maydenhod' . . IX, 236
—— Fielding's 'Champion' and Captain Hercules Vinegar . . VIII, 165
—— Fielding's Choice of Signature for 'The Champion' . . VII, 374
—— Fielding's Signatures in 'The Champion' and the Date of his 'Of Good-Nature' . . . . . VII, 97
Westcott, Allan F., Alexander Montgomerie . . . . . VI, 1
White, Albert B., Early Uses of 'Parliamentum'. . . . . IX, 92
Wicksteed, P. H., *Reviews* . . . . . III, 183; IV, 254; V, 255
Willert, P. F., *Review* . . . . . IV, 398
Williams, O. T., The Dialect of the Text of the Northumbrian Genealogies IV, 323
—— A Note on 'Exodus,' ll. 56 ff. . . . . IV, 507
—— *Review* . . . . . IV, 267
Williams, R. A., The Phonetical Explanations of Verner's Law . . II, 233
—— Syllables in Verse and Speech . . . . . V, 208
—— *Reviews* . . . . I, 345; III, 187; IV, 553; VII, 275; VIII, 412
Williams, W. H., The Date and Authorship of 'Jacke Jugeler' . . VII, 289
—— 'Hostages to Fortune' . . . . . VI, 386
—— 'Irisdision' in the Interlude of 'Johan the Euangelist'. . III, 369
—— 'Love's extreamest Line' . . . . . VI, 386
—— Marlowe and Lucian . . . . . X, 222
—— Occleve, 'De Regimine Principum,' ll. 299, 621 . . . IV, 235
—— 'Palamon and Arcite' and 'The Knightes Tale' . . IX, 161, 309
—— 'Pierce the Plowman's Crede,' l. 372 . . . . . IV, 235
—— 'Ralph Roister Doister' and 'The Wasps' . . . . VII, 235
—— Shakespeare, 'King Lear,' Act IV, sc. vi, 70–72 . . . VI, 88
—— Shakespeare, 'Macbeth,' Act III, sc. iv, 89–92 . . . V, 106
—— Shakespeare, 'Twelfth Night,' Act I, sc. v, 150 and Act I, sc. v, 205 . . . . . III, 171
Willoughby, L. A., An Early Translation of Goethe's 'Tasso' . . IX, 223
—— Goethe's 'Tasso' in England . . . . . IX, 382

Willoughby, L. A., Two Unpublished Middle High German Poems . v, 297
—— *Reviews* . . . . . ix, 558; x, 122
Wilmowsky, F. F. von, 'Commencement' and 'Commissary' . . vi, 360
Wilson, John Dover, Anthony Munday, Pamphleteer and Poursuivant iv, 484
—— Giles Fletcher and 'The Faerie Queene' . . . . . v, 493
—— John Lyly's Relations by Marriage . . . . . v, 495
—— The Missing Title of Thomas Lodge's Reply to Gosson's 'School of Abuse' . . . . . iii, 166
—— *Reviews* . . . . . vi, 103; ix, 527
Wilson, F. P., Marston, Lodge, and Constable . . . . . ix, 99
—— *Review* . . . . . ix, 391
Winstanley, L., *Review* . . . . . v, 234
Woodbine, George E., Fragment of an Unknown Middle English Poem . iv, 236
Woodbridge, Benjamin M., Gatien de Courtilz, Sieur du Verger: A French Precursor of Lesage . . . . . ix, 475
Worrall, Walter, 'Backare' etc. . . . . viii, 544
—— 'Herkinalson' . . . . . ix, 242
Wyld, Henry Cecil, Old English 'Gefyrhþe' and 'Frið' and the Latin Suffix '-ēdum' . . . . . v, 347
—— Old Scandinavian Personal Names in England . . . v, 289
—— *Reviews* . . . . . ix, 107; x, 109

Young, A. B., 'Ahrimanes' by Thomas Love Peacock . . . iv, 217
—— Shelley and M. G. Lewis . . . . . i, 322
—— Shelley and Peacock . . . . . ii, 228
—— *Reviews* . . . . . ii, 271, 368; iii, 304
Young, Mary Vance, Voiture and Steele . . . . . viii, 93

SUBJECT INDEX

'Absence, hear thou my protestation,' The Authorship of, VI, 383.
Academic Plays, *see* University Plays.
Achillini, C., and G. R. Weckherlin, X, 370.
Adrastus parentans, University Play, III, 154.
Aguilar, Rose d', Two Letters to Goethe, IV, 515.
Alamanni, L., VI, 247.
Alexander, Sir William, III, 11; VI, 158, 330; VII, 307.
—— *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*, V, 439.
Alexis, Vie de St, Str. cxi, 2, VI, 98.
Alfonso X, *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, X, 338.
Alfred's *Orosius*, Two Fragments of, VIII, 59.
Aliscans, IX, 41
Alleyn, Edward, II, 10; IV, 410; V, 216.
American Literature, IX, 398, 540.
Ancren Riwle, The, IV, 433; VIII, 133; IX, 63, 145, 324, 463.
Angels, The Craven, VI, 85.
Anglo-French *Life of Saint Osith*, An, VI, 476; VII, 74, 157.
—— *Life of Saint Paul the Hermit*, IV, 491.
Anglo-Norman, V, 120; VI, 135.
—— *Apocalypse* from Shaftesbury Abbey, An, VIII, 338.
—— *Calendar*, An, II, 211.
—— *Life of Edward the Confessor*, Fragment of an, III, 374.
Anglo-Normands, Étude sur quelques Vocables, VI, 174.
Anglo-Saxon, *see* Old English.
Antichrist, Old French, by Henri d'Arci, I, 269; by Geoffroi de Paris, II, 26.
Antipoe, University Play, III, 151.
Apocalypse, An Anglo-Norman, from Shaftesbury Abbey, VIII, 338.
—— and Commentary, The Earliest French, VII, 445.
Appius and Virginia, The Authorship of the Later, VIII, 433.
Arci, Henri d', Old French *Antichrist*, I, 269.
Arden of Feversham, Act III, sc. v, 51 ('Deep pathaires'), I, 233, 326.
Ariosto, Ludovico, and Thomas Lodge, II, 158.
Aristophanes, *The Wasps*, *Ralph Roister Doister* and, VII, 235.
'Athenian Virtuosi, The,' and 'The Athenian Society,' VII, 358.
Aucassin et Nicolete, xxi, 5–8, VI, 100.
Audelay, John, Fifteenth Century Carols by, V, 473; VI, 68.
Averroes, Dante and, IV, 255.

Bacon, Francis, *Of Marriage and Single Life* ('Hostages to fortune'), VI, 386.
—— *The World*: its Date and Relation to certain other Poems, VI, 145.
—— and Shakespeare, IX, 527.
Baena, Juan Alfonso de, and Dante, III, 117.
Baker, Sir Richard, *Theatrum redivivum*, X, 377.
Ballad Literature, III, 76, 295; VI, 260, 513; VIII, 64; IX, 131, 235, 419; X, 311.
—— Collections of the Eighteenth Century, X, 283.
Balzac, H. de, (*Le Lys dans la Vallée*), Sainte-Beuve and Thackeray, IX, 517.
—— I, 76.
Barberino, Francesco da, *Documenti d'Amore*, V, 146, 503.
Barclay, Alexander, Poet and Preacher, VIII, 289.
Barclay, John, *Argenis*, translated by John Jacob, IV, 392.
Baretti, Giuseppe, VII, 422; VIII, 267.
Barnabas, The Gospel of, Dante and, III, 157.
Barnes, Barnabe, *The Devil's Charter*, Notes on, I, 122, 139; II, 167.
—— and Desportes, VI, 203.
Basileia seu Bellum Grammaticale, Tragico-Comoedia, V, 199.
Bastard, Thomas, *Epigrammes*, VI, 152.
'Battifolle' Letters, sometimes attributed to Dante, The, VII, 19; IX, 173.
Baudelaire, Charles, IX, 122; X, 8.
Beaumont, F., and Fletcher, J., *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, II, 362; IV, 87, 155, 415.
—— II, 374; IX, 112; X, 112.
Behn, Mrs A., and Southerne's *The Fatal Marriage*, IV, 352.
Beichte, Bruchstücke einer mittelniederdeutschen, II, 342.
Bembo, Pietro, and Lodge, II, 156; Drummond, V, 52.
—— V, 151.
Bentheim, H. L., and Shakespeare, I, 318.
Beowulf, and *Daniel A*, VIII, 537.
—— 'Nicras' (ll. 422, 575, 845, 1427), X, 85.
—— Notes on, I, 202; V, 286.
—— The 'Shifted Leaf' in, X, 37.
—— III, 288, 303; IV, 265, 273; VI, 128, 266, 542; VII, 126, 268, 379; VIII, 207, 242, 550; IX, 429; X, 387.
Berkeley, Bishop, *Queries relating to a National Bank*, I, 286.
Bernart de Ventadorn, III, 331.
Beroul's *Tristan*, A Note on the Dialect of, and a Conjecture, VIII, 189.
Bewcastle Cross, The, X, 28.
Bible, The English, V, 357; VII, 248.
Binet, Claude, IV, 289; VI, 268.
Blake, William, I, 343; V, 236; VIII, 550; IX, 536; X, 390.
Blount, Edward, *Six Court Comedies*, I, 47.
Blümlin Vergissmeinnit, Von dem: A Middle High German Poem, IX, 359.
Boccaccio, Giovanni, Commentary on the *Divina Commedia*, II, 97.
—— *Decamerón*, I, iii, VIII, 306.
Bodmer, J. J., and Shakespeare, I, 320.
Borck, K. W. von, German translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, I, 321, IX, 37.

Boyd, Henry, Translation of Dante, I, 20.
Brant, Sebastian, *The Ship of Fools*, VIII, 290.
Brentano, Christian, an H. C. Robinson, Ein unbekannter Brief, VIII, 533.
Breton, Nicholas, *The Passionate Shepherd*, Milton's *L'Allegro* and, VI, 206.
Brewer, Antony, *The Love Sick King*, II, 361; The Date of, IV, 87.
Bridges, Robert, VI, 534; VIII, 240.
Brooke, Arthur, *Romeus and Juliet*, VII, 517.
Browne, Sir Thomas, *Religio Medici*, and Drummond, VII, 99, 241.
—— *Vulgar Errors*, Book IV, ch. xii, VI, 171.
Browne, William, 'Underneath this sable hearse,' etc., VI, 517.
Browning, R., VI, 127, 276, 535; IX, 132.
—— *Sordello*, X, 234.
Brunetière, F., and Comparative Literature, I, 1; VIII, 13.
Brussels Cross, The Date of the Old English Inscription on the, X, 157.
Buchanan, George, III, 94.
Buggbears, The, VI, 525.
Burbage, Richard, II, 11; IV, 395.
Bürger, G. A., V, 128.
Burney, Charles, Translation of Dante, I, 18.
Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, II, 63; III, 170; The Title of, IV, 233.
Buti, Francesco da, Commentary on Dante, II, 107.
Butt, John, and *Piers Plowman*, V, 206; VI, 302; VIII, 88.
Buttet, Claude de, Drummond and, VI, 467.
Byrne, Mrs., *Zofloya*, as Source of Shelley's Romances, VII, 54.
Byron, Lord, IV, 127; V, 237; in Germany, I, 152; II, 188.
—— and Espronceda, IV, 35.

Caesar and Pompey, The Academic Tragedy of, V, 435; VII, 111.
Cáin Domnaig, Quelle und Abfassungszeit der Sonntagsepistel in der irischen, II, 138.
Calderón de la Barca, I, 64; IV, 178; V, 78.
Camden, William, *Britannia*, VII, 97.
Campion, Thomas, VI, 121; X, 231.
Canadian North West, The Polyglot Vernacular of the, X, 88.
Cancer, University Play, The Source of, VI, 87.
Cancioneiro da Vaticana, Two Passages in the, X, 93.
Cañizares, José, *El Dómine Lucas*, IV, 473.
Carew, Thomas, VII, 99, 299.
Carey, Lady, Spenser and, III, 257; V, 274.
Carlisle, Earl of, translation of Dante, I, 16.
Carlyle, Thomas, VI, 125, 536.
Carols and other Pieces, Fifteenth Century, VIII, 68.
Cartier, Jacques, Rabelais and, III, 209; V, 71.
Cary, H. F., Translation of Dante, I, 24; The Centenary of its Completion, VII, 326.
Casa, G. della, *Il Galateo*, V, 156.
Castelvetro, Ludovico, IX, 280.
Castiglione, B., *Il Cortegiano*, V, 146, 502.

Catalan Notes, x, 89.
Cavalcanti, G., III, 324.
Cervantes, Miguel de, I, 258, 352; IV, 180, 432, 512; VI, 279; IX, 421, 554.
Chansons de Geste, Four (*Chanson de Roland*, *Chanson de Willelme*, *Aliscans*, *Garin le Lorrain*): A Study in Old French Versification, VIII, 352; IX, 41; X, 310.
—— III, 82; IX, 278.
Chapman, George, *Bussy d'Ambois*, The Date of, III, 126.
—— *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*, IV, 40; Ambassador La Boderie and the 'Compositeur' of the Byron Plays, IV, 158; VI, 203.
—— *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, I, 95; III, 137.
—— 's Plays, Notes on the Text of, III, 56.
—— I, 141; III, 396; IV, 156, 159; V, 437; VI, 253.
Charms, The Old English, VI, 262, 289.
Chateaubriand, La Première Histoire indienne, et sa Source américaine, VIII, 15.
—— and Milton, V, 409.
Chaucer, Geoffrey, *Canterbury Tales*, A 1534–39 (Chaucer's Friday), IX, 94; A 4134 and D 415, (A possible Source of), III, 72.
—— *Hous of Fame*, ii, 421 ff.; IV, 18.
—— *The Knightes Tale*, ll. 297, 309 ff., IV, 16; Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite* and, IX, 161, 309.
—— *The Legend of Good Women*, VI, 136; ll. 285 ff., 298 ff., IV, 18; The Prologue to, in Relation to Queen Anne and Richard, VII, 488.
—— *Prologue*, IV, 420; ll. 177–181, 525 ff., IV, 14.
—— *The Milleres Tale*, VII, 145.
—— *The Shipman's Prologue*, V, 430.
—— *Troilus and Criseyde*, X, 267.
—— *The Wife of Bath's Tale*, VI, 458.
—— as the Author of *Merciles Beaute*, V, 33, 194.
—— Attributions in MS. R. 3. 19, in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, VIII, 539.
—— 's Captivity, IV, 234.
—— IV, 109, 273, 418, 525, 526; V, 115; VI, 532, 537; VIII, 104; IX, 458.
Chester, Robert, IX, 533.
Chevalerie Vivien, The Boulogne Manuscript of the, V, 54.
Cinthia's Revenge, The Authorship and Original Issue of, II, 348.
Cleanness, Notes on, ll. 817 f., 994 f., X, 373; ll. 1413 ff., X, 188.
Clene Maydenhod, *Of*, *A Luue Ron* and, IX, 236.
Cleveland, John, VII, 553.
Clough, A. H., VI, 539.
Club Law, III, 148; IV, 268.
Coleridge, S. T., IV, 119; V, 236; VIII, 546
—— German Influence on, II, 86; IV, 121; IX, 348.
Collin, Matthäus von, Grillparzer and, V, 464.
Commedia dell' Arte, The, VIII, 563.
Comparative Literature, I, 77; The Future of, VIII, 1.

Comparative Study of Literature, The, I, 1.
Composites and Word-Coinage, Indefinite, VIII, 324.
Concettismo, Concerning an Aspect of, VIII, 331.
Confessor, University Play, III, 155.
Constable, Henry, VI, 6, 158; IX, 99; and Desportes, III, 275.
Conti, Antonio, and Shakespeare, I, 318.
Corneille, Pierre, *Trois Discours* (German translation), IX, 214.
—— Two Unnoticed Poems, probably by, X, 226.
Court Performances before Queen Elizabeth, II, 1.
—— under James the First, IV, 153.
Courtesy Books of the Sixteenth Century, Italian, V, 145, 502.
Courtilz, Gatien de, Sieur du Verger, a Precursor of Lesage, IX, 475.
Coventriae, Ludus, The Problem of the, IX, 79; X, 47.
Cowley, Abraham, I, 145; II, 177; VI, 211.
Cowper, William, II, 77.
Crabbe, G., II, 266; III, 173; IX, 537.
Cramer, C. F., *Petrarkaoden*, VI, 192, 374; Unbekannte Jugendgedichte, VII, 351.
Crashaw, R., Translation of Marino's *La Strage degli Innocenti*, X, 378.
Craven Angels, The, VI, 85.
Cromwell's, Lady Mary, Marriage, Epithalamium upon, IX, 374.
Cura Pastoralis, III, 279.
Cynewulf, II, 175; V, 396; VI, 437.
—— and Cyneheard in Gaimar, X, 42.

Daniel, Arnaut, III, 317; Dante and, IV, 145.
Daniel, Samuel, *Delia*, The French and Italian Sources of, III, 268; VII, 153.
—— *To the Lady Margaret, Countess of Cumberland*, I, 232.
—— I, 44; III, 2.
Daniel, A, Beowulf and, VIII, 537.
Danish Language and Literature, IV, 132; VII, 134; IX, 500.
Dante Alighieri, *Convivio*, V, 122; VI, 134; i, 7 (Remarks on Translation), VIII, 191; ii, 2, 13 (The 'Gentile Donna'), X, 129, 320; iv, 11, I, 222.
—— *Divina Commedia*, I, 158, 256; VII, 565; Boccaccio's Commentary on the, II, 97. *Inferno*, IV, 274; V, 397; V, 124; IX, 64–105, IX, 101; IX, 112–117 (The Sepulchres at Pola), IV, 390; XIV, 94 ff., V, 394; XVIII, 28–33 (Allusion to Rome), IX, 381. *Purgatorio*, I, 158, 355; VII, 421; IX, 442 (Influence on Shelley); i, III, 376; iii, 136–141, IX, 103; VI, 124–126, IX, 104; XXIV, XXVI (Dante, Guido Guinicelli and Arnaut Daniel), III, 317; IV, 145. *Paradiso*, IX, 134; XXVI, 106–108 ('Pareglio'), I, 116.
—— *Epistolae*. The Vatican Text (Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat. 1729) of the Letters of Dante, VII, 1. *Epistola* V, Letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (S. Pantaleo Text), VII, 214; Critical Text, X, 150. *Epistola* VI, § 6, Two Proposed Emendations in, V, 337. *Epistola* VII, Letter to the Emperor Henry VII (S. Pantaleo Text), VII, 208; Venetian Text (Cod. Marc. Lat. XIV, 115), VII, 433; Italian Translation of the S. Pantaleo Text, IX, 332; Critical Text, X, 64. The 'Battifolle' Letters, sometimes attributed to Dante, IX, 173.

Dante Alighieri, *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, IV, 254; V, 255.
—— *Vita Nuova*, III, 183, 408; IV, 274, 552; VI, 545; §§ 35–39 (Dante's 'Gentile Donna'), X, 129, 320; The Inquisition and the 'Editio Princeps' of the, III, 228.
—— *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, III, 313; i, 7, III, 375; IV, 237.
—— The Centenary of the Completion of Cary's translation, VII, 326.
—— English Translations of, in the Eighteenth Century, I, 9.
—— Gibbon and, VI, 215, 518.
—— and the *Gospel of Barnabas*, III, 157.
—— and the 'Mahabharata,' VII, 243.
—— in Relation to the Sports and Pastimes of his Age, I, 173, 302.
—— Jonathan Richardson and Portraits of, VIII, 202.
—— in Spanish Literature, The Influence of, III, 105.
—— Wit and Humour in, VIII, 27.
—— 's Lyrical Metres: His Theory and Practice, III, 313.
—— I, 73, 155, 255, 256, 351; II, 191, 254, 292; III, 183, 303, 408; IV, 131, 274, 398; V, 262, 394, 534; VI, 85, 547; VIII, 262, 275, 549, 566; IX, 429.
D'Avenant, Sir William, Notes on Some Poems of, VIII, 540.
Day, John, I, 44; IV, 158; V, 168.
Dekker, Thomas, I, 49, 138.
—— *Satiro-Mastix*, VI, 398.
Deloney, Thomas, VII, 561.
Deschamps, E., The Chaucerian *Merciles Beaute* and three Poems of, V, 33.
Desmaizeau, Pierre, Translation of Dante, I, 10.
Desportes, Ph., and the Elizabethan Sonneteers (Constable, Daniel, Lodge), III, 272.
—— Drummond and, III, 1, 4, 14; Lodge and, II, 155.
—— Spenser's *Amoretti* and, IV, 65; VI, 203.
—— Suckling and, V, 497; VI, 221.
Des Voeux, Charles, translation of Goethe's *Tasso*, IX, 223.
Devereux, Walter, Earl of Essex, Gascoigne and, IV, 232, 510.
Dido and Aeneas, A Tragedy of (1607), IX, 525.
Dodsley, R., *Museum* (Translation of Dante), I, 12.
Dolce, Lodovico, Lodge and, II, 158.
Donne, John, *The Curse*, ll. 14–16, IX, 239.
—— *Elegy* 'Since she must go,' ll. 39–43, X, 86.
—— *Hexastichon ad Bibliopolam*, IX, 238.
—— *Hymn to God, my God, in my sicknesse*, l. 6, IX, 237.
—— *Life and Letters of*, by E. Gosse, Notes on, VIII, 47.
—— *The Undertaking*, ll. 4–5, IX, 238.
—— Sermons, A Chronological Arrangement of, VIII, 468; Their Relation to his Poetry, VII, 40.
—— III, 80; V, 492; VI, 151, 383, 397; IX, 269; X, 385.
Dorat, Jean, IV, 289; VI, 212.
Drayton, Michael, *Sonnets*, II, 164.
—— IV, 112; VI, 158.
Drummond, William, of Hawthornden and Browne's *Religio Medici*, VII, 99, 241.
—— and the French Poets of the Sixteenth Century, V, 40.

Drummond, William, of Hawthornden and the Poets of the Plêiade, IV, 329.
—— Indebtedness to Sidney, VI, 157.
—— On the Italian and French Sources of, VI, 462.
—— Unpublished Poems of, from the Hawthornden MSS., VI, 324; VII, 98, 300.
—— III, 1; IV, 290; VI, 385; VII, 299; IX, 262.
Dryden, John, *Palamon and Arcite*, I, l. 404, VI, 386; and *The Knightes Tale*, IX, 161, 309.
—— *Parallel of Poetry and Painting*, III, 75.
—— I, 147, 313; V, 232, 233; VI, 87; VII, 94, 117, 255, 359.
Du Bartas, V, 50; Influence on Drummond, V, 261; VII, 307.
Du Bellay, J., VI, 214; and Daniel, III, 268.
—— and the Scottish Poets, III, 11; IV, 340.
Dufresny, Charles Rivière, VI, 335.
Dumas, Alexandre, *Les Trois Mousquetaires*, IX, 475.
Dunton, John, VII, 364.
Duperron, Cardinal, Ben Jonson and the, IV, 81.
D'Urfey, Thomas, Ballad Collection, X, 283.
Dutch Literature, III, 301.
—— —— Middle, II, 343; V, 178; VI, 371; VII, 277.

Eadwacer (Odoaker), II, 365.
'Earth upon Earth,' III, 218.
East Anglia, The Mythical Ancestor of the Kings of, IV, 508.
Edward the Confessor, Fragment of an Anglo-Norman *Life of*, III, 374.
Edward I, Elegy on the Death of King. From a new MS., VII, 149.
Effen, Justus van, and Goldsmith, VIII, 314.
Eliot, George, III, 304; X, 390.
Elizabethan Drama, I, 136; V, 211, 349, 510; VI, 118, 406, 559; VII, 105, 251; X, 382.
—— Sonneteers and the French Poets, The, III, 268.
English Language and Grammar, I, 234; III, 199; V, 241, 244, 346, 377, 380; VI, 131, 277, 558; VIII, 133, 274, 422; IX, 409, 410; X, 88, 109, 118, 385.
—— Old, I, 252; II, 70, 175, 365; III, 278, 287, 392; IV, 267, 272, 323, 431, 507; V, 347, 381, 396, 531; VI, 165, 199, 437; VII, 268, 379; VIII, 59, 118; IX, 133, 282; X, 28, 42, 109, 157; Charms, VI, 262, 289; Gospel of Nicodemus, X, 222; The Letter 'g' ('ȝ'), VI, 441; VII, 520; VIII, 206; Northumbrian, II, 70; IV, 323; VII, 266; *Psalter*, IV, 185; VII, 557; Riddles, *see Exeter Book*. *See also Beowulf*.
—— Middle, I, 72, 133; III, 288; IV, 106; V, 282; VII, 149; VIII, 64, 133, 215; IX, 560; X, 128, 188, 237, 373; *Paternoster*, by an Anglo-French Scribe, III, 69; Poem, Fragment of an Unknown, IV, 236; V, 104; Spellings, Some Early, IV, 505. *See also* Chaucer, *Gawayne*, *Havelok*, *Merciles Beaute*, *Patience*, *Pearl*, *Piers Plowman*.
Espronceda, José de, IV, 20.
Etymologies, English, VI, 471; VII, 318, 499.
Evans, Henry, and the Blackfriars, IV, 156; VIII, 90.

Evans, Thomas, *Old Ballads*, x, 295.
Exchange Ware, University Play, III, 151, 373.
Exeter Book, Riddles of the, IX, 271, 400 ; No. I, II, 365 ; Nos. V and XC, VI, 433.
Exodus, The Old English, ll. 56 ff., IV, 507 ; ll. 63–134, VI, 165.

Facetus, III, 357 ; V, 504.
Faire Maide of Bristow, The, Notes on, III, 73.
Farquhar, George, Influence on Lessing, II, 56.
Fazio degli Uberti, *Il Dittamondo*, I, 173 ; II, 44.
Febrer, Andreu, Translation of Dante, III, 108.
Field, Nathaniel, III, 134 ; IV, 395.
Fielding, Henry, in Leyden, I, 327.
—— *The Champion*, Signatures in, VII, 97, 374 ; and Captain Hercules Vinegar, VIII, 165.
—— *Of Good Nature*, The Date of, VII, 97.
Figueroa, Christóbal Suárez de, III, 41 ; IV, 425.
Figueroa, Francisco de, Three Sonnets attributed to, II, 223.
Fish-Names, Etymology of, VII, 441 ; VIII, 185 ; IX, 190.
Flaubert, G., VIII, 400 ; IX, 412.
—— *Salammbô*, Une Source possible de, IX, 379.
Fletcher, Giles, and Ronsard and Du Bellay, III, 276.
—— and the *Faerie Queene*, V, 493.
—— Giles and Phineas, V, 221.
Fletcher, John, II, 364 ; *The Chances*, The Date of, IV, 512 ; V, 112, 210.
Folksongs, Kentucky, VI, 513.
Folquet de Marseille, VI, 549.
Fontane, Theodor, III, 218.
Fontenelle, B., Swift and, VIII, 307.
Ford, John, VII, 108.
Foscolo, Ugo, in England, VII, 132.
Francis, St, II, 253 ; III, 407.
Fraunce, Abraham, *Victoria*, University Play, III, 141, 177, 373.
Fraus Honesta, University Play, III, 152.
Fraus Pia, University Play, III, 155.
French Language and Grammar, I, 253 ; IV, 542, 544.
—— Old, I, 353 ; II, 376 ; IV, 428, 431 ; V, 54, 185 ; VI, 98, 100 ; VII, 402, 445 ; VIII, 189, 248, 251 ; IX, 117, 278, 416 ; X, 244 ; 304 ; Unpublished Texts, I, 269 ; II, 26 ; IV, 70, 200. *See also* Chansons de Geste.
Frere, J. H., II, 271.
Frisian, V, 382 ; VI, 280.
Fucus, sive Histriomastix, University Play, III, 152 ; V, 356.
Furnivall, F. J., VII, 262.

'G' ('3'), The Old English Name for the Letter, VI, 441 ; VII, 520 ; VIII, 206.
Gaimar, Cynewulf and Cyneheard in, X, 42.
Gamon, Chr. de, and Drummond, V, 51.
Garin le Lorrain, IX, 45.

Garrick, David, I, 76 ; VII, 387.
Gascoigne, George, III, 17, 25 ; IV, 130 ; VI, 88 (*The Spoyle of Antwerpe*), 414, 524.
—— and Shakespeare, IV, 231, 510.
Gawayne and the Green Knight, Sir, ll. 697–702, II, 167 ; ll. 681, 966 f., 1439 f., 1729–32, VIII, 160 ; ll. 151 ff., 210 ff., 1235–40, 1489 ff., X, 188 ; ll. 1460, 2263, X, 225.
Geffroi de Paris, Old French *Antichrist*, II, 26.
Genesis, The Old English, IX, 282 ; ll. 1145 and 1446–8, VI, 199.
Genitive Suffix in the First Element of English Place Names, The, VII, 64.
Gentleness and Nobility : The Authorship and Source, VI, 458.
German Language and Grammar, I, 345 ; II, 377 ; III, 187, 299 ; V, 90 ; VI, 273, 274.
—— Early New High, III, 189, 356; IV, 531 ; X, 122; Unpublished Texts, I, 55 ; VI, 183.
—— Middle High, I, 66; II, 277; IV, 128; V, 388; VII, 413, 540; IX, 558; Unpublished Poems, V, 297 ; VI, 503; IX, 359; Prose Fragments, X, 203.
—— Old High, III, 299 ; VII, 275.
—— West Middle, as spoken at Marburg an der Lahn, The Sounds of, V, 90.
Germanic, III, 278 ; VII, 314 ; VIII, 412 ; IX, 105 ; X, 349.
Ghost, The Pre-Shakespearean, I, 85, 192.
Ghosts, Shakespeare's, I, 192.
—— in English Literature of the 18th century, II, 368.
Gibbon, Edward, and Dante, VI, 215, 518.
Giffard, W., Anglo-Norman *Apocalypse*, VIII, 338.
Gildon, Charles, VII, 363.
Gill, Alexander, and Ben Jonson, VII, 296.
Gillies, R. P., and Goethe, IV, 89.
Giraut de Bornelh. *See* Guiraut de Bornelh.
Godwin, W., II, 228 ; *St Leon*, VII, 57.
Goethe, J. W. von, *Clavigo*, an English Translation of, VIII, 204.
—— *Faust*, I, 163, 354 ; III, 379 ; VII, 538 ; A Jest of Goldoni's in, VII, 100.
—— *Tasso*, in England, IX, 223, 382.
—— R. P. Gillies and, IV, 89.
—— Two Unpublished Letters from an English Translator of *Goetz von Berlichingen* to, IV, 515.
—— Zwei Friederikenlieder ('Erwache Friedericke,' 'Dem Himmel wachs entgegen'), VII, 469.
—— II, 275 ; III, 195 ; IV, 275, 537 ; VI, 423 ; VIII, 257 ; IX, 426.
Goethe, Ottilie von, VIII, 258 ; IX, 223.
—— an Unpublished Letter to A. Hayward from, VIII, 377.
Goldoni's, A Jest of, in Goethe's *Faust*, VII, 100.
Goldsmith, Oliver, in Leyden, I, 328.
—— Indebtedness to Justus van Effen, VIII, 314.
—— II, 280 ; V, 397.
Golubinaia Kniga, X, 78.
Gongorism, VIII, 331.
Gorboduc, VII, 517 ; VIII, 218.
Gormond et Isamberd, X, 312.

Gosson, Stephen, *The School of Abuse*, Lodge's Reply to, III, 166; IV, 485.
Gothic, VI, 272.
—— Bible, *Philemon*, 22 ('bijandzuþ'), I, 328.
Gower, Lord F. Leveson, Translation of Schiller, IX, 244.
Grammar Plays, Academic, V, 199.
Grammont, Mémoires de, Walpole and the, X, 58.
Gray, Thomas, *The Bard*, 11 ff., and Muretus, V, 345.
—— Translation of Dante, I, 11.
—— 's Poems, The Text of, II, 165.
—— V, 375; IX, 113, 257.
Greek, Modern, VIII, 419.
Greene, Robert, Textual Puzzles in the Works of, I, 208.
—— *Menaphon*, IV, 458; The Relation of *The Thracian Wonder* to, II, 34.
—— I, 93, 238, 337; II, 63; V, 215, 394; VIII, 223.
Grettis Saga and *Beowulf*, X, 38.
Greville, Fulke, IV, 296.
Griffin, B., *Fidessa*, and Du Bellay, III, 271.
Grillparzer, F., VIII, 407; *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*, Notes on, V, 454.
Grimald, Nicolas, Translation of Metrodorus, VI, 145.
Gringoire, P., *Le Chasteau de Labour*, VIII, 295.
Groto, Luigi, and Drummond, VI, 465.
Grynaeus, Simon, *Novus Orbis*, Rabelais and, II, 316.
Guarini, G. B., *Rime*, as a source of Daniel's *Delia*, VII, 153.
—— and Drummond, VI, 331.
Guazzo, Stephano, *Civil Conversation*, V, 160.
Guinicelli, Guido, Dante and, III, 317; IV, 145.
Guiraut de Bornelh, III, 332; IV, 147; *Los Apleitz*, I, 222.

Halifax, Marquess of, VIII, 229.
Hall, Bishop Joseph, *Virgidemiae*, V, i, 65–72, III, 169.
Hamann, J. G., II, 370; VIII, 405.
Hardy, Thomas, VII, 390.
Harvey, Gabriel, IV, 289.
'Have' before a Past Participle, The Omission of, V, 346.
Havelok the Dane, II, 176; Minor Notes on, IV, 91; A New *Havelok* MS., VI, 455.
Hayley, William, Translation of Dante, I, 17.
Hebbel, Friedrich, VIII, 145.
—— *Agnes Bernauer*, The Source of, IV, 302; VII, 330.
Hegel, G. W. F., Theory of Tragedy, VI, 226.
Heine, Heinrich, and Byron, I, 152.
Heinric van Aken, *Die Rose*, Ein neues Bruchstück, VI, 371.
Henryson, R., *The Testament of Cresseid*, X, 268.
Henslowe's *Diary*, IV, 407; V, 168, 436.
Herd, David, *Ancient and Modern Scottish Songs*, X, 290.
Heroic Line, Milton's, II, 289; III, 16, 232; IV, 93; V, 107.
Herrick, R., VII, 381; VIII, 110; IX, 530.
—— *Hesperides*, IX, 373; VII, 519 ('Dean-bourn'); VIII, 92.

Heywood, Jasper, Translation of Seneca, I, 89; IV, 437.
Heywood, John, III, 148; VI, 459.
Heywood, Thomas, III, 152; IV, 87; V, 222; VIII, 442; X, 278.
Himmelsbrief Christi, Der, II, 138.
Hispanic, VII, 377; VIII, 97.
Hita, El Arcipreste de, II, 258; III, 112.
Hoadley, S., *Basileia seu Bellum Grammaticale*, Tragico-Comoedia, V, 199.
Hölderlin, F., and 'Diotima,' VII, 193.
Holinshed's *Chronicle*, IV, 263.
Holtei, Karl von, and Wilhelm Müller, I, 212.
Holyday, Barten, *A Survey of the World*, and the *Dittamondo*, II, 44.
Hormayr, Joseph, V, 454.
Horn, King, II, 176.
Hoskins, John, VI, 385.
'Hostages to fortune' (Bacon, *Of Marriage and Single Life*), VI, 386.
Huggins, William, Translation of Dante, I, 14.
Hughes, Thomas, *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, I, 90.
Hugo, Victor, *Notre Dame de Paris*, An Episode in, IX, 246.
—— *Préface de Cromwell*, X, 242.
—— *L'Homme qui rit*, The Use of Chamberlayne's *L'État présent de l'Angleterre* in, VIII, 496; The Use of *Les Délices de la Grande Bretagne* in, VIII, 173.
—— VIII, 130.
Hunnis, William, II, 4; IV, 155; VIII, 91.
Hurtado de Mendoza, Diego, II, 79; IV, 258.
Hymenaeus, University Play, V, 356.

I, West Germanic, in Old English Saxon Dialects, III, 278.
Iamblichus, *De Mysteriis*, and Goethe's *Faust*, III, 381.
Icelandic, VI, 278; An Icelandic Proverb 'Thin End of the Wedge,' V, 348.
Imola, Benvenuto da, II, 101, 106.
Imperial, Francesco, and Dante, III, 112.
Ingannati, Gli, V, 342; VI, 525, 528.
'Irisdision' (*Interlude of Johan the Evangelist*), II, 351; III, 369.
Isle of Dogs, The, Ben Jonson and, IV, 411, 511.
Isle Sonnante, The Authorship of the, II, 14, 129.
Italian Courtesy Books of the Sixteenth Century, V, 145, 502.
—— Language and Grammar, II, 256; VIII, 100; X, 391.
—— Verse, VI, 415.
—— Version of the Legend of Saint Margaret, VI, 23.

Jacke Jugeler, The Date and Authorship of, VII, 289.
—— ll. 256–259, X, 375.
Jacob ben Machir ben Tibbon, The Almanac of (ca. 1300), III, 376.
Jacob, John, Translation of Barclay's *Argenis*, IV, 392.
James I, VI, 5; VIII, 115; Court Performances under, IV, 153.
—— *Demonology*, I, 197.
James I of Scotland, VI, 412.

Jennings, H. C., Translation of Dante, I, 21.
Johan the Evangelist, The Enterlude of, Textual Notes on, II, 350; III, 369.
Johannes des Wisen *Marienlob*, VI, 503.
Jonson, Ben, *The Alchemist*, I, 141.
—— *Cynthia's Revels*, III, 269; IV, 157; IX, 259; Act I, sc. 5, 30, I, 232.
—— *Discoveries*, Jonson's Method in the, II, 201.
—— *Every Man out of his Humour*, II, 360; VI, 154.
—— *Memorandums of the Immortal Ben*, I, 111.
—— *The New Inn*, IV, 413; VII, 298.
—— *The Poetaster*, I, 142; IV, 157.
—— *The Sad Shepherd*, II, 360.
—— *The Staple of News*, I, 143, 327.
—— *Underwoods*, I, 251; VII, 299.
—— and the Cardinal Duperron, IV, 81.
—— and *The Isle of Dogs*, IV, 511.
—— Notes on, from a Seventeenth Century Common-Place Book, VII, 296.
—— I, 142; II, 349; III, 128; VII, 105.
Journée des Dupes, La, IX, 516.

Keats, John, I, 148; III, 85.
—— *Isabella*, Stanza xiii, line 2, VIII, 543.
—— Allusions in *Adonais* to the Poems of, VI, 354.
Keble, John, *Lectures on Poetry*, VIII, 553.
Kempe, William, II, 10; IV, 88.
Kentucky Folk-songs, VI, 513.
Keyser, Robert, IV, 154.
Kierkegaard, Sören, IX, 500.
King Edward III and Shakespeare's Sonnets, VI, 511.
King Leir, I, 69; III, 304; V, 515.
Kleist, H. von, Influence on Hebbel, VII, 337.
Klinger, F. M., VI, 10; VIII, 276.
Knack to know an Honest Man, A, Notes on, VII, 236.
Körner, Theodor, Two Poems attributed to, VIII, 53.
Kotzebue, A. von, Grillparzer and, V, 469.
Kyd, Thomas, I, 90; VI, 409; IX, 523; X, 173, 382.

La Boderie, Ambassador, and the 'Compositeur' of the Byron Plays, IV, 158; VI, 203.
Laelia, University Play, V, 343; VI, 382, 525, 528.
Lamartine, A. de, II, 184.
Lamb, Charles, *Christ's Hospital Thirty-five Years Ago*, III, 75.
—— *Oxford in the Vacation*, III, 74.
Landor, W. S., Two Unpublished Poems of, VII, 375.
Langland, William, as the Author of *Piers Plowman*, IV, 1; V, 1, 195; VI, 302.
Laplace, P. A. de, Translation of Shakespeare, IX, 22.
Larivey, P., *Le Fidelle*, III, 373.
Latin, Vulgar, III, 298.
Latin Plays acted at Cambridge, VI, 87. *See also* University Plays.

Latini, Brunetto, v, 145.
Lavater, L., *De Spectris*, i, 198.
Lazarillo de Tormes, iv, 258.
Legge, Thomas, *Richardus Tertius*, iii, 141.
Leigh, Richard, vii, 359.
Leisewitz, J. A., vi, 10.
Lessing, G. E., *Beyträge zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters*, Notes on, viii, 511; ix, 213.
—— *Laokoon*, and Marmontel, vi, 216.
—— *Minna von Barnhelm*, and Farquhar, ii, 56.
—— *Nathan der Weise*, Act i, sc. ii, viii, 203.
—— and Shakespeare, ix, 76.
—— in England, ix, 197, 344.
Lestrange, Roger, *The Virgin Captive*, and Southerne's *Fatal Marriage*, iv, 354.
Lewis, M. G., *The Monk*, Shelley and, i, 322; vii, 54.
Lexicographical Notes, i, 188.
Leys d'amors, iii, 313.
Lingua, University Play, iii, 146, 149.
—— *Macbeth* and, iv, 517.
Lipowsky, F. J., *Agnes Bernauerin*, Hebbel and, iv, 309.
Lipsius, Justus, iii, 169.
Locher, Jacob, *The Ship of Fools*, viii, 290.
Locrine, i, 90; v, 215, 518.
—— and *The Faery Queene*, viii, 369.
Lodge, Thomas, and the Italian Poets, ii, 155.
—— Reply to Gosson's *School of Abuse*, The Missing Title of, iii, 166.
—— iii, 2, 275; vi, 158; ix, 99.
Longfellow, H. W., Translation of Dante, vii, 328.
Lope de Vega, Notes on some Comedias of, i, 96.
—— *La Arcadia*, The Date of Composition of, iii, 40.
—— *El Caballero de Olmedo*, iv, 464.
—— *El Dómine Lucas* and some related Plays, iv, 462.
—— ii, 225, 374; iv, 179; v, 79.
'Love's extreamest line' (Dryden, *Palamon and Arcite*, i, l. 404), vi, 386.
Lucian, Marlowe and, x, 222.
Ludus Coventriae, The Problem of the, ix, 79; x, 47.
Luminalia, The Authorship of, viii, 540.
Luue Ron, A, and *Of Clene Maydenhod*, ix, 236.
Lydgate, John, *The Serpent of Division*, vii, 253; viii, 103.
—— *Verses on Queen Margaret's Entry into London*, vii, 225.
Lyly, John, and the Oxford Stage, vi, 92.
—— Plays, The Authorship of the Songs in, i, 43.
—— 's Relations by Marriage, v, 495; vi, 219.
—— i, 330; ii, 7; iii, 155; vi, 103.

Macaulay, George Campbell, x, 392.
Mairet, Jean de, ii, 261; iv, 115.

Mallarmé, Stephan, x, 7.
Malone Society, The, II, 90; V, 134.
Mantuan, Milton's *Ode on the Nativity* and the Poems of, II, 121.
Marcabru, Provençal poet, III, 330; VI, 549.
March, Ausias, and Dante, III, 110.
Margaret, An Italian Version of the Legend of Saint, VI, 23.
Mariengebete, Zwei altfranzösische, IV, 70, 200.
Marino, G. B., and Drummond, III, 1; VI, 462.
—— and Weckherlin, X, 369.
—— *La Strage degli Innocenti*, Translation by Crashaw, X, 378.
Marivaux, *La Vie de Marianne*, Richardson and, VIII, 464.
Marlowe, Christopher, I, 95; V, 355, 440; VI, 137, 408; VIII, 220; IX, 111.
—— Textual Notes on (*Dido*, ll. 813, 1151, 1629; *Edward II*, ll. 883–4, 2072, 2097–8; *The Massacre at Paris*, ll. 70–71, 549–51, 997; *The Rich Jew of Malta*, ll. 26, 945, 1783, 1924–7; *Tamburlaine*, ll. 631, 3627, 3679, 4317), VI, 94.
—— *Faustus*, xiii, 91; 2 *Tamburlaine*, ii, 4, and Lucian, X, 222.
—— at Cambridge, IV, 167.
Marmontel, J. F., Lessing and, VI, 216.
Marot, Clément, IV, 245; VI, 247; IX, 543.
Marprelate Controversy, The, IV, 488; VI, 108.
Marston, John, I, 94; II, 362; IV, 158; IX, 99.
Marvell, Andrew, IX, 374.
Mason, John, *The Turke*, VIII, 371.
—— *Princeps Rhetoricus*, Academic Grammar Play, V, 200.
Massinger, Ph., I, 49, 138; III, 347; VII, 107; IX, 112.
Masuccio Salernitano, VII, 145.
May, Thomas, V, 436.
Mease, Peter, *Adrastus parentans*, III, 154.
Mediaeval Religious Drama, English, III, 396; VII, 546; VIII, 121; French, II, 375; III, 302; German, X, 120.
Mena, Juan de, and Dante, III, 118.
Merciles Beaute, The Chaucerian, and three Poems of Deschamps, V, 33, 194.
Meredith, George, VI, 126; VIII, 114; X, 115, 236.
'Merril's Bridge,' X, 84.
Metge, Bernat, and Dante, III, 109.
Metric, English and French, VII, 522; VIII, 104; IX, 385; X, 102.
—— *See also* Prosody.
Metrical Form, The Mental Side of, IX, 297.
Middle English, *see* English, Middle.
Middle High German, *see* German, Middle High.
Middleton, Thomas, I, 48; IV, 158, 195; VII, 106, 413.
Miller, Johann Martin, VI, 10.
Milton, John, *L'Allegro* and Breton's *The Passionate Shepheard*, VI, 206.
—— *Comus*, IV, 113; VI, 530.
—— *Lycidas*, l. 162 ('Namancos'), II, 124.
—— *Ode on the Nativity* and the Poems of Mantuan, II, 121.
—— *Paradise Lost*, VI, 259. *See also* Milton's Heroic Line.

Milton, John, *Samson Agonistes*, l. 373, III, 74, 373.
——'s Heroic Line, viewed from an Historical Standpoint, II, 289; III, 16, 232; IV, 93 (Milton and Syllabism); V, 107.
—— in Rome, VIII, 91.
—— Influence on Chateaubriand, V, 409.
—— I, 9; II, 376; V, 118, 230; VIII, 111, 224, 549.
Mira de Mesqua, II, 82; IV, 181; V, 78.
Mirror for Magistrates, A, I, 70.
Misfortunes of Arthur, The, II, 9; VIII, 218.
Misogonus, VI, 524.
Moir, George, Translation of Schiller, IX, 245.
Molière, J. B. P., IV, 131; V, 126; VI, 556; IX, 548.
—— in England, IX, 127; 430.
Montaigne, M. de, II, 182; III, 305; IV, 401; V, 361; VII, 537.
Montalván, Juan Pérez de, IX, 556; *Los Amantes de Teruel*, IV, 354.
Montgomerie, Alexander, VI, 1; and Ronsard, III, 14.
Moore, Thomas, et A. de Vigny, I, 290; in France, VII, 272.
Mora, Domenico, *Il Cavaliere*, V, 164.
Morality Play, An Unknown Protestant, IX, 94.
Morhof, D. G., Mention of Shakespeare, I, 312.
Moro, Mauritio, and Drummond, VI, 469.
Morton, Sarah W., *Ouabi* (Source of Chateaubriand), VIII, 16.
Mulcaster, Spenser and, VIII, 368.
Müller, Wilhelm, Newly Discovered Political Poems of, I, 212.
Munday, Anthony, Autograph Plays by, VIII, 89.
—— *The Two Italian Gentlemen*, III, 178.
—— Pamphleteer and Pursuivant, IV, 484.
Muralt, B. de, on Shakespeare, I, 316; IX, 13.
Muretus, *Juvenilia*, LXXXIX, Gray and, V, 345.
Muzio, G., *Il Gentilhuomo*, V, 158.
Mystiker-Handschrift, Eine mittelniederländische, V, 178.

'Namancos' (Milton, *Lycidas*, l. 162), II, 124.
Nashe, Thomas, III, 258; IV, 290; V, 215; VI, 241.
Negative in Concessive Sentences, The Irrational: A Study in Germanic Syntax, X, 349.
Nenna, G. B., *Il Nennio*, V, 153.
Neville, Alexander, Translator of Seneca, IV, 444.
Newton, Thomas, Translator of Seneca, IV, 447.
Nicodemus, The Old English Gospel of, X, 222.
Nodier, Charles, X, 242.
Norman Scribe, The Troubles of a, V, 282.
Northumbrian, II, 70; VII, 266.
—— Genealogies, The Dialect of the Text of the, IV, 323.
Nuce (or Newce), Thomas, Translator of Seneca, IV, 445.

Occleve, *De Regimine Principum*, ll. 299, 621, IV, 235.
Old English, *see* English, Old.

Old French, *see* French, Old.
Old High German, *see* German, Old High.
Opitz, Martin, IV, 337; VI, 164; VII, 472.
Optatus, *De Chismate Donatistarum*, VIII, 308.
Osith, An Anglo-French *Life of Saint*, VI, 476; VII, 74, 157.

Palmerin of England, II, 79.
Palmieri, M., *Vita civile*, V, 146.
Paria, University Play, The Source of, VI, 87.
Paris in 1749, A Visit to, IX, 514.
Paris, Gaston, and Comparative Literature, I, 1.
Paris, Matthew, *Historia Minor*, English Tags in, IV, 509.
—— IX, 93.
Parnassus Plays, The, III, 148; X, 162.
Paschale, Lodovico, and Lodge, II, 156.
Pasqualigo, L., *Il Fedele*, III, 178, 373.
Passerat, Jean, and Drummond, V. 40; VI, 467.
Pastoral Drama, II, 83; IV, 110.
Paterno, L., and Drummond, VI, 161, 466.
Paternoster, A Thirteenth Century, by an Anglo-French Scribe, III, 69.
Pathomachia, University Play, III, 149.
Patience, VIII, 396; IX, 403.
Paul the Hermit, An Anglo-French *Life of*, IV, 491.
Peacock, Thomas Love, *Ahrimanes*, IV, 217, 521.
—— Shelley and, II, 228; V, 529.
Pearl, IV, 132; In Defence of, II, 39.
Pedantius, University Play, I, 235; III, 142.
Peele, George, *David and Bethsabe*, Act I, sc. i, VII, 373.
—— I, 93, 139, 337; II, 64; V, 215.
Peletier du Mans, J., IV, 269.
Percy's *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*, X, 287.
Personal Names in England, Old Scandinavian, V, 289.
Petrarch, F., III, 2, 91, 198, 272; IV, 65, 242; V, 257; VI, 192, 280, 374; VIII, 262, 423; X, 369.
Phagifacetus, III, 357.
Phillimore, Sir Robert, and Lessing, IX, 344.
Phonetics (Pronunciation), II, 233; IV, 553; V, 208; VII, 314; IX, 284, 285, 427.
—— English, II, 74; III, 199; IV, 272; VI, 276, 534; VIII, 423; IX, 53, 107, 273; X, 109.
—— French, IV, 553; IX, 284.
—— German, I, 345; IV, 553; V, 90; IX, 284.
Pickering, John, *Horestes*, I, 89.
Pierce the Plowmans Crede, II, 190; l. 372, IV, 235.
Piers Plowman, The Vision of, The Alliteration of, IV, 478.
—— The Authorship of, IV, 1; V, 1, 195, 202.
—— One or Five, VII, 102, 372.
—— The Original Form of the A-Text of, VI, 302.

Piers Plowman, The Vision of, Some Cruces in (B, xiii, 150–151 ; B, vi, 328–329 ; C, ix, 351–352), v, 340.
—— A, ii, 87, 101 ; B, xvi, 219 ('moillere'), ii, 163.
—— C, Prologue, 215 (An unrecorded Reading), iii, 170.
—— The Text of. i. The A-Text, iv, 357.
—— Was 'Langland' the Author of the C-Text of?, iv, 1.
—— Who was John But?, viii, 88.
—— iv, 108 ; viii, 396.
Pilgrimage to Parnassus, The, x, 162.
Pinkerton, John, *Scottish Tragic Ballads*, x, 292.
Place-Names, v, 120, 289; vi, 534; ix, 240 ('hale,' 'haile,' etc.).
—— The Genitive Suffix in the First Element of English, vii, 64.
—— Lancashire, vi, 543; vii, 64.
—— Nottinghamshire, ix, 405; x, 84.
—— Oxfordshire, vii, 64; viii, 243.
—— Sussex, x, 238.
—— Yorkshire, viii, 264; x, 106.
Plautus, viii, 273; Lessing and, viii, 517.
Pléiade, The, ii, 260; The Composition of the, vi, 212.
—— Spenser and, iv, 289.
Plotinus in Tennyson, A possible Reminiscence of, ii, 327.
Pope, Alexander, *Essay on Criticism*, iii, 17.
—— *The Rape of the Lock*, vii, 94.
—— *Windsor Forest*, ll. 65, 66, vii, 97.
Portuguese Literature, iii, 88 ; ix, 418, 553 ; x, 93, 119, 338.
—— Spelling, viii, 99.
Povyest o Ershe Ershove, x, 81.
Preciosity, iv, 551 ; viii, 331.
Prévost, The Abbé, and Shakespeare, x, 196.
Priamel, The, iii, 189.
Princeps Rhetoricus, Academic Grammar Play, v, 200.
Prior, Matthew, i, 343; x, 232.
Pronunciation, Authorities on English, ix, 53.
Prosody (Metrics), v, 208, 505; ix, 105, 297.
—— English, ii, 65, 261 ; iii, 80 (Donne), 181 ; v, 227, 521 ; vi, 230, 540 (Clough); vii, 123, 257, 391, 522, 542 ; viii, 241 ; Milton, ii, 289; iii, 16, 232; iv, 93; v, 107.
—— English and French, ii, 189; vii, 104; ix, 385; x, 102.
—— French, ix, 549.
—— Italian (Dante), iii, 313.
Provençal, i, 160, 222, 353 ; iii, 329; iv, 145, 426, 427, 540 ; vi, 549; x, 246.
—— Words in English, i, 283 ; ii, 60.
Prynne, W., *Histriomastix*, x, 377.
Psalter, Paris, on the Text of the Prose Portion of the, iv, 185.
Psyche et filii ejus, University Play, iii, 143.
Puttenham, G., *The Arte of English Poesie*, vi, 146.

Quevedo y Villegas, F. de, and Dante, III, 123.

Rabelais, François, *Gargantua*, c. 15 (Don Philipe des Marays), VIII, 199.
—— *Isle Sonnante*, The Authorship of the, II, 14, 129.
—— and Geographical Discovery, II, 316; III, 209; V, 68.
—— on Language by Signs, VIII, 193.
—— III, 403; V, 536; VI, 134; VII, 536; IX, 546.
Racine, J., IV, 546.
Radcliffe, Mrs Ann, *The Italian*, VII, 55.
Ramsay, Allan, Ballad Collections, X, 283.
Returne from Parnassus, The, I, 139; III, 270; X, 164.
Revels Office, Accounts of the, II, 1; IV, 153; V, 510; IX, 94.
Richardson, Jonathan, and Portraits of Dante, VIII, 202.
—— *Discourse on the Dignity of a Connoisseur* ('Connoissance'), II, 166.
—— Translation of Dante, I, 9.
Richardson, Samuel, and his French Predecessors, VIII, 464.
—— The Character of Lovelace, VII, 494.
Riche, Barnabe, *Of Phylotus and Emilia*, V, 342.
Richier, *Vie de St Remi*, IX, 117.
Riddles, Old English, II, 365; VI, 433; IX, 271, 400.
Ritson, Joseph, Collections of Ballads, X, 299.
Rivière, P., *Ship of Fools*, VIII, 290.
Robinson, H. Crabb, IX, 225, 382.
Rocabarti, Fra, and Dante, III, 105.
Rogers, Charles, Translation of Dante, I, 19.
Rolli, Paolo, and the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, VIII, 200.
Romanic Speech-History, Notes on, VIII, 484; IX, 493.
Romanticism, English, V, 234; VI, 520; VIII, 235. *See also* Coleridge, S. T.
—— French, II, 280; VII, 269; X, 242.
—— German, I, 154; II, 273; VIII, 276.
Ronsard, François, Sir W. Alexander and, III, 13.
—— Drummond and, IV, 329; VI, 330; Lodge and, II, 155.
—— II, 260; IV, 289, 337; VI, 212, 268; VII, 476.
Rousseau, J. J., Influence on Shelley, IX, 450.
Rowe, N., *The Fair Penitent*, and Richardson, VII, 494.
Rowley, William, VII, 106, 548.
Roydon, Matthew, IX, 97.
Rumanian, IX, 251.
Runic Alphabet, X, 28.
Russian, II, 189.
—— Literature, I, 259; VII, 135; VIII, 416; The Beginnings of, X, 73.
Ruthwell Cross, The, X, 28.

'S' in Germanic, On the Pronunciation of, VII, 314.
Sainte-Beuve, *Volupté*, Balzac and Thackeray, IX, 517.
Saint Évremond, X, 100.
—— *Parallèle de Monsieur le Prince et de Monsieur de Turenne*, VIII, 374.

Saint-Gelais, Mellin de, III, 273; IV, 246, 249; VI, 249.
—— Octavien de, VIII, 299.
Salas, Pedro de, *El Dómine Lucas*, IV, 472.
Salimbene, Fra, II, 253.
Sannazaro, J., II, 155; III, 2, 273; VIII, 393; X, 248.
Santillana, Marqués de, and Dante, III, 108, 114; Thackeray and, X, 380.
Scandinavian Names, VIII, 246.
—— Personal Names in England, Old, V, 289.
Scève, Maurice, II, 182; IV, 243.
Schiller, J. F. von, *Prolog zum Wallenstein*, Sheridan's *Verses to the Memory of Garrick* and, IX, 246.
—— *Wallenstein*, Two English Translations of, IX, 243; Coleridge's Translation of, II, 87.
—— I, 150; II, 192, 275; VI, 423.
Schlegel, A. W., IV, 124.
—— F., II, 273.
Schmalkaldischen Krieg, Ein historisches Lied vom, VI, 183.
Schroeder's, F. L., Ausschreiben und die drei Brudermorddramen (1775), VI, 9.
Scot, Reginald, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, I, 198.
Scott, Sir Walter, III, 227.
—— Espronceda and, IV, 26.
Scottish Sonneteers and the French Poets, The, III, 1.
Sealsfield, Charles, Bibliographical Notes on, III, 360.
Seicentismo, VIII, 331.
Seneca, The Elizabethan *Tenne Tragedies* of, I, 89; IV, 437.
—— The Ghost in, I, 86; IV, 459.
—— Jonson, Daniel and Wordsworth, I, 232.
—— Translation of, VII, 246.
Serafino of Aquila, IV, 250; VI, 466.
Shaftesbury, Lord, Influence in Germany, IX, 424.
Shakespeare, William, *All's Well that Ends Well*, IV, 192; Act IV, sc. v, 14–22, VI, 383.
—— *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act III, sc. xiii, 158–167, III, 372.
—— *As You Like It*, IV, 197; VI, 154; Act II, sc. i, 5, IX, 370.
—— *The Comedy of Errors*, IV, 194, 347; VIII, 273; Act II, sc. ii, 65, X, 224.
—— *Coriolanus*, IV, 195; VIII, 437; Act III, sc. ii, 39, I, 54.
—— *Cymbeline*, I, 50; III, 348.
—— *Hamlet*, I, 128, 196; IV, 192; VI, 154; VIII, 569; The *Hamlet* Quartos, 1603, 1604, V, 196; The First Quarto *Hamlet*, X, 171.
—— *Henry V*, IV, 344.
—— *Henry IV*, Part II, I, 194; II, 72; IV, 344; Act III, sc. ii, 339, I, 53.
—— *Henry VI*, I, 192; VIII, 220.
—— *Henry VIII*, III, 343.
—— *Julius Caesar*, I, 194; IV, 191; V, 438; VII, 111; X, 127; Act II, sc. iv, I, III, 149; Act V, sc. i, 56–58, II, 348; German translation by K. W. von Borck, I, 321; IX, 37.
—— *King John*, IV, 346; Act III, sc. iii, II, 348.

Shakespeare, William, *King Lear*, I, 69, 128; V, 515; Act I, sc. ii, IV, 84, 238; Act IV, sc. vi, 70–72 ('wealk'd'), VI, 88, 209; The Revision of, V, 445.
—— *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, 347.
—— *Macbeth*, I, 128, 195; IV, 194; X, 383; Act III, sc. iv, 89–92, V, 106; Act IV, sc. vi, 5, I, 54; and *Lingua*, IV, 517.
—— *Measure for Measure*, IV, 193; Act II, sc. i, 39, V, 197.
—— *The Merchant of Venice*, IV, 345.
—— *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, IV, 198; VII, 547; Act I, sc. iii, 93, IV, 88; Act IV, sc. ii, 46–48, sc. v, 69–72, VII, 239.
—— *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act II, sc. i, 148–168, IV, 231; Act III, sc. i, 112 ('a headless bear'), I, 232; II, 63, 350; Act V, sc. i, 305, III, 149.
—— *Much Ado About Nothing*, IV, 118, 197.
—— *Othello*, I, 128; III, 292; IV, 194; V, 395; Act IV, sc. ii, 144 ('speak within door'), V, 501; Act IV, sc. ii, 106; sc. iii, 106 (Two exits), X, 375.
—— *Richard II*, III, 344.
—— *Richard III*, I, 192, 237; IV, 347; V, 176, 260; X, 224; Act V, sc. iii, I, 53.
—— *Romeo and Juliet*, IV, 346; VII, 517; X, 178; Act II, sc. ii, 38 ff., X, 223; Act III, sc. i, 84 ('dry-beat'), X, 224; Act IV, sc. iii, 57, I, 54.
—— *Sonnets*, IV, 130; VI, 251; No. LI, 10 f., IX, 372; X, 167; Nos. XCIV, CXLII (*Edward III* and Shakespeare's Sonnets), VI, 511.
—— *The Taming of the Shrew*, IV, 342; Act II, sc. i, 73 ('baccare'), VIII, 373, 544.
—— *The Tempest*, III, 345; IV, 422; Act III, sc. ii, 63; Act IV, sc. i, 179, I, 53.
—— *Timon of Athens*, IV, 195; VI, 257.
—— *Troilus and Cressida*, IV, 193; VI, 402; X, 265, 278; Act I, sc. ii, 118; Act IV, sc. iv, 58 ('merry Greek'), I, 231; Act III, sc. iii, 161–163, III, 371.
—— *Twelfth Night*, IV, 197; V, 342; VI, 529; VII, 552; Act I, sc. v, 150, 205, III, 171; Act III, sc. ii, 45, 71, II, 347.
—— *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, IV, 347.
—— *A Winter's Tale*, III, 345, 355; VII, 551; VIII, 222.
—— and Fletcher, John, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Act III, sc. v, 97, 98; Act IV, sc. i, 142, VI, 205; The Mad Songs in, V, 200.
—— and *Titus Andronicus*, I, 337; II, 63.
—— The Abbé Prévost and, X, 196.
—— Gascoigne and, IV, 231.
—— on the Continent at the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century, The Knowledge of, I, 312; IX, 12.
—— in France, II, 356; IX, 22, 415; X, 196.
—— in Germany, IV, 531; Wieland's Translation of, IX, 12.
—— in Hungary, III, 200; in Poland, IX, 134.
——'s Ghosts, I, 192.
——'s Plays: An Examination, III, 337; IV, 190, 342.
—— I, 128, 140, 334, 342; II, 74, 265, 353, 358; III, 297; IV, 126, 411; V, 119, 213, 228, 260, 349, 361, 520; VI, 227, 410, 530, 536; VII, 110, 249, 252, 387, 559; VIII, 549; IX, 527; X, 228, 382.
Sharpham, Edward, *The Fleire*, IV, 159; VIII, 371.

Shelley, Percy B., *Adonais*, Allusions in, to the Poems of Keats, VI, 354.
—— *History of a Six Weeks' Tour*, Notes on, II, 61.
—— Notes on Passages in, I, 25.
—— *The Triumph of Life*, Notes on, I, 31; IX, 441.
—— *The Witch of Atlas*, I, 30; VII, 508.
—— *Zastrozzi* and *St Irvyne*, VII, 54.
—— and M. G. Lewis, I, 322; VII, 54.
—— and Peacock, II, 228; V, 529.
—— V, 239; VI, 523; VII, 383; VIII, 114; IX, 538.
Sheridan's, R., *Verses to the Memory of Garrick* and Schiller's *Prolog zum Wallenstein*, IX, 246.
Ship of Fools, The, VIII, 289.
Sidney, Sir Philip, *Apologie for Poetrie*, III, 17.
—— *Arcadia*, III, 147.
—— Drummond's Indebtedness to, VI, 157.
—— and Spenser, The Areopagus of, IV, 289.
Soliman and Perseda, IX, 523.
Somaize and Sorel, IX, 375; X, 95.
Sommacampagna, G. da, *Trattato de li rhythimi volgari*, III, 313.
Sorel, Charles, IX, 375; X, 95.
Southerne, Thomas, *The Fatal Marriage*, The Source of, IV, 352.
Spanish Literature, II, 168; IV, 422, 551; V, 253; VI, 278; VIII, 264; IX, 275.
—— —— The Influence of Dante on, III, 105.
—— Drama, Notes on the Chronology of the, II, 331; III, 43.
—— Plays, Short Stories and Anecdotes in, IV, 178; V, 78.
Spenser, Edmund, *Amoretti*, III, 260; V, 273; VI, 158, 390; IX, 459; and Desportes, IV, 65; VI, 203.
—— The Areopagus of Sidney and, IV, 289.
—— *Colin Clout*, III, 257.
—— *Epithalamion*, III, 260; V, 273; VI, 391.
—— *The Faerie Queene*, III, 257; V, 370; VII, 279; Giles Fletcher and, V, 493; *Locrine* and, VIII, 369; II, ix ('The House of Alma'), VI, 169.
—— *Muiopotmos*, III, 257; V, 273; IX, 457.
—— *Shepherd's Calendar*, IV, 112; IX, 394; 'November,' II, 346; 'December,' ll. 37–42, VIII, 368.
—— *Sonnets*, The Problem of, V, 273; 'As Published,' VI, 390.
—— and Lady Carey, III, 257; and Mulcaster, VIII, 368.
—— IV, 529; V, 117; VII, 114, 135; VIII, 114; IX, 394; X, 111.
Spoyle of Antwerpe, The, (1576), VI, 88.
Steele, Richard, and Voiture, VIII, 93.
Stendhal (H. Beyle) in England, VI, 419.
Stephens, John, as Author of *Cinthia's Revenge*, II, 348.
Stub, Edmund, *Fraus Honesta*, University Play, III, 152.
Studley, John, Translation of Seneca, IV, 441.
Suckling, Sir J., VI, 123; and Desportes, V, 251, 497; VI, 221.
Surrey, Earl of, VI, 247.
Swift, Jonathan, *A Tale of a Tub*, VIII, 301, 454; IX, 100; X, 181.

Swift, Thomas, x, 185.
Syllables in Verse and Speech, v, 208, 505.
Symbolism, French, x, 1.

Tansillo, L., Influence on Daniel, III, 272; VII, 155.
Tasso, Torquato, Daniel and, VII, 154; Drummond and, III, 3; VI, 412, 462.
Taylor, Joseph, actor, IV, 395.
Taylor, William, (of Norwich), IX, 229, 351.
Tebaldeo, A., Drummond and, III, 3, 272; V, 52.
Temple, Sir William, I, 313; III, 170; VII, 363; X, 185.
Tempo, Antonio da, *Summa artis rithimici*, III, 314.
Tennyson, Lord, *Morte d'Arthur*, ll. 254–5, A Note on, VII, 99.
—— *In Memoriam*, XCV, (A Possible Reminiscence of Plotinus), II, 327.
—— II, 271; V, 530; VI, 127; IX, 132.
Thackeray, W. M., *Henry Esmond*, Sainte-Beuve, Balzac and, IX, 517.
—— *Peg of Limavaddy*, X, 380.
Thief-Legend, A German Version of the, I, 55.
'Thin End of the Wedge,' An Icelandic Proverb, V, 348.
Thomas, *Tristan*, A Side Light on, X, 304.
Thomasin von Zirclaeria, V, 502.
Thracian Wonder, The, The Relation of, to Greene's *Menaphon*, II, 34.
Timon, University Play, III, 143.
Timoneda, Juan de, *Amphitrion* and *Los Menemnos*, Notes on, IX, 248.
Tirso de Molina, II, 171; IV, 354, 422; V, 79; VI, 278.
—— *Marta la piadosa*, IV, 466.
Titus Andronicus, I, 337; II, 63; V, 215.
Tolstoi, Alexander, VIII, 416.
Tomkis, Thomas, III, 146, 149; IV, 517.
Törring, J. A. von, *Agnes Bernauerin*, and Hebbel, IV, 303; VII, 330.
Tottel's *Miscellany*, IV, 240.
Tourneur, Cyril, I, 95; VII, 107; IX, 112.
Tractatus Orthographiae of T. H., Parisii Studentis, The, V, 185.
Traherne, T., VII, 555.
Trissino, G. G., *Poetica*, III, 314.
Troilus and Cressida, The Welsh, and its Relations to the Elizabethan Drama, X, 265.
Troubadours, IV, 426, 427, 540; VI, 549.
—— The Connection between Words and Music, in the Songs of the, III, 329.
Turold, *Chanson de Roland*, VIII, 353.
Twelfth Day, A Ballad of, VIII, 64; IX, 235.
Tyard, Pontus de, Drummond and, IV, 337.

Udall, N., *Ralph Roister Doister*, VII, 290; and *The Wasps*, VII, 235.
University Plays, Notes on some, III, 141; Some Academic Grammar Plays, V, 199; Latin Plays acted at Cambridge, VI, 87.
—— I, 235; IV, 268; V, 356, 435; VI, 382, 528; VII, 109.
Urfé, H. d', *L'Astrée*, The Date of, VIII, 101.

Valladolid, English College at, III, 144.
Verlaine, Paul, X, 9.
Verner's Law, The Phonetical Explanations of, II, 233.
Verney, Francis, *Antipoe*, University Play, III, 151.
Verse and Speech, Syllables in, V, 208, 505.
Versipellis, University Play, III, 155.
Vigny, Alfred de, The Optimism of, IX, 1.
—— Thomas Moore et, I, 290.
Vives, J. L., Ben Jonson and, II, 208.
Voiture, V., and Steele, VIII, 93.
Voltaire, F. A. de, *Lettres anglaises*, I, 319; IX, 213.
Vowel Alliteration, IX, 105.
Vunfzehn Zeichen, Die, (Middle High German Poem), V, 297.

Waller, Edmund, V, 231.
Walpole, Horace, *Anecdotes of Painting*, II, 166.
—— A Critique by, VI, 387.
—— and Mariette, IX, 520.
—— and the *Mémoires de Grammont*, X, 58.
Wardrobe Accounts of Edward III, Notes on the Supposed Dramatic Character of the 'Ludi' in the Great, IV, 474.
Warning for Fair Women, A, I, 94.
Warton, Joseph, Translation of Dante, I, 13.
—— Thomas, Translation of Dante, I, 17.
Watson, James, Ballad Collection, X, 283.
—— Thomas, *The Passionate Century of Love*, VI, 466.
Wealth and Health, An Interlude of, IV, 115; Notes on, III, 366.
Webbe, W., *Discourse on English Poetrie*, III, 17.
Webster, John, I, 141; II, 73, 373; VIII, 433.
—— *The White Divel*, Act III, sc. ii, 129–139, II, 162.
Weckherlin's, Georg Rudolf, Models, X, 366.
Welsh *Troilus and Cressida*, The, and its Relation to the Elizabethan Drama, X, 265.
Whitman, Walt, in France, X, 1.
Widsith, IV, 266, 509; VIII, 118.
Wie got das jungst Gericht besitzen sol (Middle High German Poem), V, 297.
Wieland, C. M., VIII, 203; IX, 424.
—— Translation of Shakespeare, IX, 12.
Wilson, Arthur, *The Swisser*, I, 140.
Wittenweiler, Heinrich, *Der Ring*, The Satire in, III, 356.
Word-Coinage, Indefinite Composites and, VIII, 324.
Wordsworth, William, *The Excursion*, iv, ll. 330, 331, I, 232.
—— I, 162; VI, 522; VIII, 114, 210, 238.
Worke for Cutlers, I, 138; III, 373.
Wotton, Sir Henry, VI, 151.
Wright, C. G., Translation of Dante, VII, 328.
Wulfstan, *Homilies*, II, 139; IV, 267.

Wyatt, Sir Thomas, VI, 247.
—— and the French Sonneteers, IV, 240; and Sannazaro, III, 273.

'X,' Italian, VIII, 100.

Yarington, Robert, *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, V, 167.
Young, Edward, in Germany, II, 369.

Zelotypus, University Play, III, 151.
Züricher Arzneibuchs, Bruchstücke des sogenannten, X, 203.

ETYMOLOGIES

Abro-tonu (Catalan) x, 90
accessory i, 188
acernia (acerna) (Lat.) viii, 185
addrest i, 126
adjection i, 188
adjutory i, 188
aflantare viii, 545
aisle vii, 318
aitch-bone vii, 318
aleare iv, 454
alienu (Catalan) x, 90
alteru, altu (Hispanic) vii, 377
angarde (M.E.) viii, 160
appoint iii, 74, 373
apportionment i, 188
arnement (A.N.) vi, 174
arresm (A.N.) vi, 174
attempter i, 188
average vii, 319

backare viii, 373, 544
balinger vi, 471
bash viii, 329
battledoor i, 284; ii, 60
bay (M.E.) viii, 162
bayou x, 89
bear, headless i, 232, ii, 63
beating, a dry x, 224
bijandzuþ (Gothic) i, 328
blash viii, 329
boncho (A.N.) vi, 175
bother vii, 319
bougounz (M.E.) x, 188
bowse i, 123
bozzimacu v, 500; vi, 96
broncho x, 89
buckram ix, 243
budge i, 188
bull i, 188
bumble viii, 329
bureau vii, 504
busch x, 189

cache x, 89
cadger vi, 472
calfater (Fr.) v, 498
cangle viii, 329
caprice vii, 320
ca(u)lk v, 498
cayote x, 88
cayuse x, 88
cedewal (A.N.) vi, 181
chaparejos (chaps) x, 89
chat (A.N.) vi, 175
cheechaco x, 88
chelp viii, 329
chierna (Ital.) viii, 185
chinook x, 88
chirl viii, 329
chittle viii, 329
cinch x, 89
*cinctulu (Romanic) viii, 484
cloyne iv, 454
cohorte (Romanic) ix, 493
coigne (A.N.) vi, 176
colander ii, 60
commencement vi, 360
commissary vi, 360
conch x, 89
connoissance ii, 166
conspiracy i, 188
convertine iii, 74
conynge (A.N.) vi, 176
cordevane (A.N.) vi, 176

corral x, 89
cottage i, 189
coulée x, 89
couple (A.N.) vi, 176
coursable i, 189
coveise (M.E.) iii, 171
cozen i, 189; vii, 321
criggle viii, 329
croodle viii, 329
cruce (Catalan) x, 90
crunkle viii, 329
crush i, 189
cullender ii, 60
cumber i, 189

dab i, 189
deep pathaires i, 233, 326
demean i, 189
demise i, 190
despatch vii, 504
devaye (M.E.) x, 194
dildidoes ii, 167
direct i, 190
discard vi, 473
discuss vi, 473
dismal vi, 210
dispair iii, 58
dispatchment i, 190
dowles (A.N.) vi, 176
drunkard i, 190
dry beating, a x, 224
duce (Catalan) x, 92
duo (Romanic) ix, 494

eale ix, 240
écade (Fr.) ix, 190
eject i, 190
embull i, 190
enangle i, 190
entangle i, 190
entertainment i, 190
esbat v, 500
esplanade vii, 322
-ētum (Lat.) v, 347

feltred iv, 454
feond (O.E.) vi, 201
feynz (A.N.) vi, 176
fix i, 122
flawp viii, 329
flaze viii, 329
flerk viii, 329
flotes (A.N.) vi, 177
flump viii, 329
foru (Romanic) ix, 497
fother (A.N.) vi, 177
fotmel (A.N.) vi, 177
founder i, 190
frete (freate) iv, 453
friddle viii, 329
friþ (O.E.) v, 347
frounced iv, 454
full vii, 322
funnel i, 284

garmombles vii, 240
garnishment i, 190
gavelkind vii, 322
gazette vii, 325
geană (Rumanian) ix, 251
gefyrhþe (O.E.) v, 347
geyde (A.N.) vi, 177
glumpish viii, 329
gnoffe iv, 455
gobette (A.N.) vi, 177
graspois (A.N.) vi, 177
grayn (M.E.) x, 190
Greek, merry i, 231
greinz (A.N.) vi, 178
grouse (Fr. greuce) viii, 93
guðmyrce (O.E.) iv, 507

hackney vii, 501
hale, haile ix, 240
hatchment (Fr. hachement) viii, 94
haugh ix, 240
headless bear, a i, 232; ii, 63, 350
herkinalson ix, 242
hugger-mugger vii, 323

imbrue vii, 324
impeach vii, 504
impery iv, 453
induction i, 191

infractor I, 191
inquire III, 367
interrupt I, 191
intruse I, 191
inunction I, 191
inundation I, 191
Irisdision II, 351; III, 369

jade VII, 505
joncy VIII, 97
junk (Fr. jonc-marin) VIII, 95
jury-mast VII, 502

knap VII, 235

laicu (Romanic) VIII, 485
lariat X, 89
lath (A.N.) VI, 178
latigo X, 89
league I, 284
leeng (A.N.) VI, 178
lieutenancy I, 191
lignu (Romanic) VIII, 486
lingo I, 285
linne IV, 455
litmus I, 191
lokeram (A.N.) VI, 178
look III, 73
lykemose (A.N.) VI, 178
lyngetele (A.N.) VI, 178

maces (A.N.) VI, 178
makerelle (A.N.) VI, 178
mankind III, 171
marble IV, 453
marchpane VIII, 324
marse X, 89
martingale VII, 499
martrinz (A.N.) VI, 179
meacock IV, 455
medicine X, 88
mell, III, 367
meneau (Fr.) IV, 396
merlus (Fr.) (Lat. merula) IX, 191
merry Greek I, 231
mike (mikel) (M.E.) IV, 92
moccasin X, 88
moele, meole, mole (A.N.) VI, 179
moillere (M.E.) II, 163
mokadour II, 60
moselynge II, 351
mound VII, 502
moylie I, 123, 126
muckinder II, 60
mullion IV, 396
muluwelle (A.N.) VI, 179
mush (mush-on) X, 89

nicras (*Beowulf*, ll. 422, 575, 845, 1427) X, 85
nitchie X, 88
noose I, 284
nuce (Romanic) IX, 497
nucis mugue (muge) (A.N.) VI, 179

oblata melanurus VII, 441
*oclu (Romanic) VIII, 489
octo (Romanic) VIII 491
olzine (A.N.) VI, 179
orange VII, 505
overheel IV, 455

pallet VI, 474
pandemaine VII, 376
paper VII, 505
papoose X, 88
pareglio (Ital.) I, 116
parliamentum IX, 92
partisan VII, 505
pathaires, deep I, 233, 326
pawn VII, 502
pelece (A.N.) VI, 180
pelire (A.N.) VI, 180
pillory VII, 499
pinto X, 89
pione (A.N.) VI, 180
pitz (A.N.) VI, 180
plash VII, 506
plaunch IV, 455
pleach VII, 506
pointelle (A.N.) VI, 180
poldawis (A.N.) VI, 180
pomadre (A.N.) VI, 180
porpays (A.N.) VI, 180

pour VII, 503
poys (A.N.) VI, 181
proffer VI, 97
progner (A.N.) VI, 98
proinen (M.E.) VI, 97
prune VI, 97
pun VI, 211
puncheon I, 284

quandary VIII, 544
quattuordeci (Romanic) IX, 498
quibusks (A.N.) VI, 181
quipassa VI, 205
quitter I, 191

rack I, 284
raik, to have one's III, 170; IV, 507
raisin VII, 506
rancart, mettre au (Fr.) VII, 101
rascal VII, 499
reche III, 367
reik, *see* raik
relent (Fr. relenter) VIII, 96
roge IV, 453
roister VII, 518
royle IV, 455
royst IV, 456
rummage VII, 503
rush of the sea VIII, 95

sabelyns (A.N.) VI, 181
sædberende (O.E.) VI, 199
Saracen VII, 504
saye, saie (A.N.) VI, 181
schale (M.E.) X, 191
scholes (M.E.) X, 189
sclate (A.N.) VI, 181
scotch VII, 500
scrawk VIII, 330
screek VIII, 330
screel VIII, 330
scrowge VIII, 330
sedewale (cedewal) (A.N.) VI, 181
seel (A.N.) VI, 181
sege (A.N.) VI, 182
seu (A.N.) VI, 182
sewer VII, 506
seym (A.N.) VI, 182
shad IX, 190
sherry VII, 506
Sigel-hearwa IV, 508
siringues I, 124
sirrah I, 285
siserary VIII, 544
skates VII, 506
skyreux (A.N.) VI, 182
snaggle VIII, 330
snell III, 367
snuddle VIII, 330
speak within door V, 501
spell on end, to set I, 325
spigot I, 284
spiracle I, 125
squaw X, 88
stadie IV, 453
stay VI, 474
stubble VII, 507

tabac X, 89
tally VI, 507
tarre (A.N.) VI, 182
tenderfoot X, 88
thai (though) III, 366
tike VII, 500
tomar (Hispanic) VIII, 97
topaz VII, 501
troddle VIII, 330
troubadour I, 284; II, 60

ullage I, 284

warty VIII, 92
wayd, weyde (A.N.) VI, 177
wayte what (whatever) M.E. III, 72
wealked (welked), VI, 88, 209
whice (A.N.) VI, 182
wimble-cock I, 123
wolde (A.N.) VI, 177

yetling IV, 456

BOOKS REVIEWED

Achtzehnhundertneun, herausg. von R. F. Arnold und K. Wagner (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407

Adams, A., The Syntax of the Temporal Clause in Old English Prose (H. G. Shearin) . . . . . III, 392

Åkerlund, A., The History of the Definite Tenses in English (A. C. Paues) IX, 410

Albert, F., Über Thomas Heywoods 'Life and Death of Hector' (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . V, 222

Alexander, H., The Place-Names of Oxfordshire (W. J. Sedgefield) . VIII, 243

Allodoli, E., Giovanni Milton e l' Italia (J. G. R.) . . . . . II, 376

American Poems, ed. by W. C. Bronson (G. E. Hadow) . . . IX, 540

Andeli, H. d', The Battle of the Seven Arts, ed. by L. J. Paetow (A. Barbier) . . . . . X, 244, 391

Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles, ed. by G. P. Krapp (J. H. G. Grattan) . . . . . II, 175

Angela da Foligno, Book of the Divine Consolation of, transl. by M. G. Stegman (C. Foligno) . . . . . VIII, 271

Anglade, J., Les Troubadours (H. J. Chaytor) . . . . . IV, 426

Armas, J. de, Ensayos críticos de literatura inglesa y española (H. O.) . VI, 135

Armitage, L., An Introduction to Old High German (R. A. Williams) VII, 275

Arthurian Legends, Hebrew-German, ed. by L. Landau (L. A. Willoughby) IX, 558

Ashton, H., Du Bartas en Angleterre (L. E. K.) . . . . . V, 261

Aubry, P., La Rhythmique musicale des Troubadours et des Trouvères (Barbara Smythe) . . . . . IV, 540

Austin, H. D., Citations in Ristoro d'Arezzo's 'Composizione del Mondo' (C. F.) . . . . . IX, 429

Autobiografías y Memorias, coleccionadas por M. Serrano y Sanz (H. A. Rennert) . . . . . II, 168

Aydelotte, F., Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds (F. P. Wilson) . IX, 391

Bacon, G. W., The Life and Dramatic Works of Juan Pérez de Montalván (M. A. Buchanan) . . . . . IX, 556

Baeske, W., Oldcastle-Falstaff in der englischen Literatur (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . II, 72

Bailey, J., Poets and Poetry (Helen Darbishire) . . . . . VIII, 113

Baldensperger, F., Bibliographie critique de Goethe en France (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . III, 195

—— Goethe en France (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . III, 195

—— La Littérature: Création, Succès, Durée (O. Elton) . . IX, 389

Bandello, M., Le Novelle, a cura di G. Brognoligo (C. Foligno) . . VIII, 267
Baretti, G., La Scelta delle Lettere familiari, a cura di L. Piccioni (C. Foligno) . . . . . VIII, 267
Barnes, B., The Devil's Charter, ed. by R. B. McKerrow (W. W. Greg) . I, 136
Barnouw, A. J., Anglo-Saxon Christian Poetry (A. R. Skemp) . . X, 109
Bauernfeld, E., Gesammelte Aufsätze herausg. von S. Hock (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407
Baur, A., Maurice Scève et la Renaissance lyonnaise (A. Tilley) . II, 182
Bausteine, herausg. von L. Kellner und G. Krüger . . . . I, 78
Beam, J. N., Die ersten deutschen Übersetzungen englischer Lustspiele (J. Crosland) . . . . . II, 278
Beaumont, F., and Fletcher, J., The Knight of the Burning Pestle, ed. by H. S. Murch (W. W. Greg) . . . . . IV, 415
—— Works, ed. by A. Glover and A. R. Waller (G. C. Macaulay) . X, 112
Beck, J. B., Die Melodien der Troubadours (Barbara Smythe) . . IV, 540
Beowulf, ed. by W. J. Sedgefield (P. G. Thomas) . . . . VI, 266
—— —— Second Edition . . . . . IX, 429
—— and the Finnsburg Fragment, transl. by J. R. Clark Hall (Allen Mawer) . . . . . VI, 542
—— A Metrical Translation by J. R. Clark Hall (W. J. Sedgefield) . X, 387
—— and the Finnesburh Fragment, ed. by C. G. Child (J. H. G. G.) III, 303
Berchet, G., Opere, a cura di E. Bellorini (C. Foligno) . . . VIII, 267
Berger, K., Schiller: sein Leben und seine Werke, I (J. G. Robertson) . I, 150
Berthon, H. E., et Starkey, V. G., Tables synoptiques de Phonologie de l'ancien français (A. T. Baker) . . . . . IV, 428
Bethmann, J., Untersuchungen über die mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung vom Grafen Rudolf (R. Priebsch) . . . . . IV, 128
Betz, L. P., La littérature comparée, 2nd ed. . . . . I, 77
Bible, The Authorised Version of the English, 1611, ed. by W. A. Wright (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . V, 357
Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Nueva (H. A. Rennert) . II, 168; IV, 422
Bibliotheca Hispanica, vol. XIV (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . II, 257
Bibliotheca romanica, Nos. 1–10 . . . . . I, 164; III, 200
Bickley, F., The Life of Matthew Prior (A. C. Guthkelch) . . . X, 232
Bielschowsky, A., The Life of Goethe, transl. by W. A. Cooper (J. G. R.) IV, 275
Binet, C., La Vie de Pierre de Ronsard, ed. by H. M. Evers (A. Tilley) . II, 260
—— La Vie de Pierre Ronsard, ed. par P. Laumonier (A. Tilley) . VI, 268
Black Prince, Life of the, ed. by M. K. Pope and E. C. Lodge (P. Studer) VII, 402
Bladin, V., Studies of Denominative Verbs in English (G. C. M.) . VIII, 274
Blake, William, The Lyric Poems of, ed. by J. Sampson (G. Gregory Smith) I, 343
—— Poetical Works, ed. by J. Sampson (G. Gregory Smith) . . I, 343
—— Poetical Works, ed. by J. Sampson (Oxford Edition of Standard Authors) (G. C. M.) . . . . . X, 390
Blum, J., La Vie et l'Oeuvre de J. G. Hamann (J. G. Robertson) . . VIII, 405
Bødtker, A. T., Contributions to Early English Syntax, II (A. M.) . VI, 277
Boecker, A., A Probable Italian Source of Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar' (G. C. M. S.) . . . . . X, 127

Bonaventura, A., Dante e la Musica (L. R.) . . . . . II, 191
Bond, R. Warwick, Montaigne, a Study (E. Dowden) . . . . II, 182
Borgerhoff, J. L., Le Théâtre anglais à Paris (A. Tilley) . . . IX, 415
Bosson, O. E., Slang and Cant in J. K. Jerome's Works (A. C. Paues) . IX, 410
Bourdillon, F. W., Early Editions of the 'Roman de la Rose' (R. W.) IV, 431
Boyer, P. and Speranski, N., Russian Reader (W. R. Morfill) . . . II, 189
Boynton, P. H., London in English Literature . . . . . IX, 283
Bradley, A. C., Oxford Lectures on Poetry (C. E. Vaughan) . . VI, 225
—— Shakespearean Tragedy (C. H. Herford) . . . . I, 128
Bradsher, E., Mathew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher . . VII, 565
Braga, Th., Historia da Litteratura Portugueza, II (A. F. G. Bell) . IX, 553
Braun, W. A., Types of Weltschmerz in German Poetry (K. Breul) . II, 186
Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke, herausg. von C. Schüddekopf . . III, 305
Brereton, J. Le Gay, Elizabethan Drama: Notes and Studies (W. W. G.) VI, 559
Breul, K., German-English and English-German Dictionary (J. G. R.) . II, 377
Brewer, A., The Love-Sick King, ed. by A. E. H. Swaen (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . II, 361
Breymann, H., Calderon-Studien, I (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . I, 64
Bridges, R., Poetical Works (T. S. Omond) . . . . . VIII, 240
Brilioth, B., A Grammar of the Dialect of Lorton (W. J. Sedgefield) . IX, 409
Brooke, C. F. Tucker, The Authorship of 'King Henry VI,' 2 and 3 (E. W. Lummis) . . . . . VIII, 220
Brooke, S. A., On Ten Plays of Shakespeare (G. C. Moore Smith) . . I, 334
Browning, R., Men and Women (Oxford Library) . . . . VI, 276
—— The Ring and the Book, ed. by E. Dowden . . . . IX, 132
—— Sordello, ed. by A. J. Whyte (C. H. Herford) . . . X, 234
Brückner, A., Geschichte der russischen Literatur (W. R. Morfill) . I, 259
Brüll, H., Untergegangene und veraltete Worte des Französischen im heutigen Englisch (L. Brandin) . . . . . X, 118
Buchanan, George, Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies (W. Saunders) III, 94
—— A Memorial, ed. by D. A. Miller (W. Saunders) . . . III, 94
Bürger, G. A., Gedichte, herausg. von E. Consentius (G. Schaaffs) . V, 128
Burns, R., Poems published in 1786 (G. C. M.) . . . . . VII, 423
Butler, A. J., The Forerunners of Dante (E. G. Gardner) . . . VI, 547

Caballerias, Libros de, ed. by A. Bonilla y San Martin, I (H. A. Rennert) IV, 422
Cairns, W. B., A History of American Literature (G. E. Hadow) . . IX, 398
Calvert, A. F., The Life of Cervantes (H. Oelsner) . . . . I, 352
Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. by Sir A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller . . . . . I, 261
—— Vol. I (Minna Steele Smith) . . . . . III, 287
—— Vol. II (W. Lewis Jones) . . . . . IV, 106
—— Vol. III (W. P. Ker) . . . . . V, 507
—— Vol. IV (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VI, 114
—— Vol. V (F. E. Schelling) . . . . . VI, 406
—— Vol. VI (F. E. Schelling) . . . . . VII, 105
—— Vol. VII (W. Lewis Jones) . . . . . VIII, 109

Cambridge History of English Literature (*cont.*)
—— Vol. VIII (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VIII, 223
—— Vol. IX (Carl van Doren) . . . . . VIII, 381
—— Vol. X (Carl van Doren) . . . . . IX, 254
Cambridge Verse, A Book of, ed. by E. E. Kellett (G. C. Moore Smith) VI, 538
Campion's Works, ed. by P. Vivian (F. W. Moorman) . . . VI, 121
Capelli, L. M., Tavole riassuntive della Divina Commedia (L. Ragg) I, 256
Capetti, V., L' Anima e l' arte di Dante (L. R.) . . . . IV, 274
Carpenter, H. C. A., Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Hs. (A. O. Belfour) . . . VII, 266
Cervantes Saavedra, M. de, Don Quijote, transl. by Robinson Smith (H. O.) . . . . . VI, 279
—— —— Second Edition (A. F. G. Bell) . . . . . IX, 554
—— Cinco Novelas Ejemplares (Bibliotheca romanica) (J. F. K.) . IV, 432
Chabaneau, Mélanges, 'Festschrift' for Professor Chabaneau . . . I, 261
Chadwick, H. M., The Heroic Age (Allen Mawer) . . . . . VIII, 207
—— The Origin of the English Nation (R. W. Chambers) . . IV, 262
Chambers, E. K., and Sidgwick, F., Early English Lyrics (W. P. Ker) . III, 395
Chambers, R. W., Widsith (Allen Mawer) . . . . . VIII, 118
Chapman, G., All Fooles and the Gentleman Usher, ed. by T. M. Parrott (J. Le Gay Brereton) . . . . . III, 396
—— Bussy D'Ambois and The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois, ed. by F. S. Boas (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 137
—— The Plays and Poems of, ed. by T. M. Parrott: The Tragedies (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VI, 253
Charlton, H. B., Castelvetro's Theory of Poetry (J. G. Robertson) . IX, 280
Chatterton, T., The Rowley Poems, ed. by M. Hare (G. C. M.) . VII, 423
Chaucer's Prologue and Knight's Tale, ed. by M. Bentinck Smith (Allen Mawer) . . . . . IV, 420
—— Prologue, Knight's Tale and Nun's Priest's Tale, ed. by F. J. Mather (J. H. G. G.) . . . . . III, 303
Chiappelli, A., Della Trilogia di Dante (L. Ragg) . . . . I, 256
Chinard, G., L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française (A. T.) . . . . . IX, 284
—— L'Exotisme américain dans la littérature française au XVI^e^ siècle (A. Tilley) . . . . . VII, 536
Chistoni, P., La Seconda Fase del Pensiero Dantesco (L. R.) . . II, 192
Choisy, L. F., Alfred Tennyson . . . . . IX, 132
Christ, W. von, Griechische Literaturgeschichte (R. Petsch) . . VIII, 413
Citoleux, M., La Poésie philosophique au XIX^e^ siècle (F. Gohin) . II, 184
—— Madame Ackermann (F. Gohin) . . . . . II, 184
Clarke, M. G., Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period (Allen Mawer) . . . . . VII, 126
Clásicos Castellanos, I, II (J. F. K.) . . . . . VI, 278
Classen, E., Vowel Alliteration in the Old Germanic Languages (Allen Mawer) . . . . . IX, 105
Cleveland, John, The Poems of, ed. by J. M. Berdan (G. C. Macaulay) . VII, 553

Clough, A. H., Poems, ed. by H. S. Milford (T. S. Omond) . . VI, 539
Club Law, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (W. W. Greg) . . . . IV, 268
Cohen, G., Die Inszenierung im geistlichen Schauspiele des Mittelalters in Frankreich (L. B.) . . . . . III, 302
Coleridge, S. T., Biographia Literaria, ed. by J. Shawcross (Oliver Elton) IV, 119
—— Poetical Works, ed. by E. H. Coleridge (E. de Sélincourt) . VIII, 546
——'s Literary Criticism, ed. with introd. by J. W. Mackail (Oliver Elton) . . . . . IV, 119
Collison-Morley, L., Giuseppe Baretti (C. F.) . . . . . VII, 422
Cook, A. S., A Concordance to the English Poems of Thomas Gray (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . V, 375
—— and Tinker, C. B., Select Translations from Old English Prose (A. M.) . . . . . IV, 431
Coppo, G., Legend of the Holy Fina Virgin of San Geminiano, transl. by M. Mansfield (C. Foligno) . . . . . VIII, 271
Cory, H. E., The Critics of Edmund Spenser (G. C. M.) . . . VII, 135
Cosenza, M. E., Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors (H. O.) . VI, 280
Cossio, A., L' Archeologia dell' Arte in Dante (L. R.) . . . . V, 394
—— Sulla 'Vita Nuova' di Dante (L. R.) . . . . . IV, 274
Coulton, G. G., Chaucer and his England (G. C. Macaulay) . . IV, 525
—— From St Francis to Dante (L. Ragg) . . . . . II, 253
Courthope, W. J., A History of English Poetry, V, VI (Helen Darbishire) VI, 520
Cowl, R. P., An Anthology of Imaginative Prose . . . . . VII, 566
—— The Theory of Poetry in England (C. H. Herford) . . X, 381
Cowley, A., Essays, Plays and Sundry Verses (G. C. Macaulay) . . II, 177
—— The Poems of, ed. by A. R. Waller (G. C. Macaulay) . . I, 145
Cowper, W., The Complete Poetical Works of, ed. by H. S. Milford (A. R. Waller) . . . . . II, 77
—— The Poems of, ed. by J. C. Bailey (A. R. Waller) . . II, 77
Crabbe, G., Poems, ed. by A. W. Ward (R. Huchon) . . . . II, 266
Crawford, J. P. W., Life and Works of C. S. de Figueroa (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . . . IV, 425
Creizenach, W., Geschichte des neueren Dramas, IV, 1 (A. W. Ward) V, 349
Crescini, V., Manualetto provenzale (G. A. Parry) . . . . I, 160
Crónica General, Primera, publ. por R. Menéndez Pidal, I (H. A. Rennert) . . . . . IV, 422
Crónicas del Gran Capitán, por A. Rodríguez Villa (H. A. Rennert) . IV, 422
Curme, G. O., A Grammar of the German Language (R. A. Williams) . III, 187

Dante Alighieri, Convivio, transl. by W. W. Jackson (Paget Toynbee) V, 122
—— La Divina Commedia, a cura di R. Fornaciari (L. Ragg) . I, 256
—— La Divina Commedia, ed. by C. H. Grandgent (Paget Toynbee) V, 124, 397; VII, 421; IX, 134
—— La Divina Commedia, per cura di G. A. Scartazzini (5a ed.) (L. R.) II, 192
—— La Divina Commedia, transl. by Sir S. W. Griffith (L. R.) . VII, 565
—— La Divina Commedia, transl. by H. F. Tozer (L. Ragg) . I, 158
—— The Purgatorio of, transl. by C. G. Wright (L. Ragg) . . I, 158

Dante Alighieri, Quaestio de Aqua et Terra, ed. and transl. by C. L. Shadwell (P. H. Wicksteed) . . . . . v, 255
—— La Quaestio de Aqua et Terra, ed. by V. Biagi (P. H. Wicksteed) iv, 254
—— Tutte le Opere di, rivedute da E. Moore (3a ediz.) (L. Ragg) . i, 73
—— La Vita Nuova, per cura di M. Barbi (P. H. Wicksteed) . iii, 183
—— La Vita Nova, trad. par H. Cochin (L. Ragg) . . . iv, 552
—— La Vita Nuova, with Rossetti's version, ed. by H. Oelsner (L. Ragg) iv, 552
—— La Vita Nuova, per cura di M. Scherillo (Paget Toynbee) . vi, 545
—— La Vita Nuova e il Canzoniere (Edizione Vade Mecum) (L. R.) iii, 408
—— e la Lunigiana (L. R.) . . . . . v, 262
—— Library, University College, London, Catalogue of the (H. O.) . viii, 275
Davidson, A. F., Victor Hugo, his Life and Work (H. Chatelain) . viii, 130
Davies, T. R., French Romanticism and the Press (A. T.) . . . ii, 280
Davis, E. Z., Translations of German Poetry in American Magazines, 1741–1810 (Margaret W. Cooke) . . . . . vi, 422
Dekker, T., Old Fortunatus, ed. by O. Smeaton (W. W. Greg) . . i, 136
—— Satiro-Mastix, herausg. von H. Scherer (T. M. Parrott) . vi, 398
Delattre, F., Robert Herrick (F. S. Boas) . . . . . ix, 530
Deloney, T., The Works of, ed. by F. O. Mann (H. V. Routh) . . vii, 561
De Sanctis, F., Saggio critico sul Petrarca (L. R.) . . . . iii, 198
Deutschbein, M., Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands, i (W. P. Ker) . ii, 176
Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts, Nos. 146–150 (R. P.) . . . . . ix, 560
Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, i, iv (R. Priebsch) . . . . i, 66
Dimnet, E., Les Sœurs Brontë (Grace E. Hadow) . . . . vii, 556
Dixon, W. MacNeile and Grierson, H. J. C., The English Parnassus (F. W. M.) . . . . . vi, 558
Dodd, L. H., A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies (O. T. Williams) . iv, 267
Dodgson, E. S., The Baskish Verb (W. J. Edmondston-Scott) . . viii, 272
Donne, J., Poems, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson (E. K. Chambers) . . ix, 269
D'Ovidio, F., Il Purgatorio e il suo preludio (L. R.) . . . . i, 355
Draper, W. H., Petrarch's Secret (H. O.) . . . . . viii, 423
Drummond, W., of Hawthornden, Poetical Works, ed. by L. E. Kastner (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . ix, 262
Dryden, J., The Poems of, ed. by J. Sargeaunt (G. R. Noyes) . . vii, 117
—— Selected Dramas of, ed. by G. R. Noyes (A. W. Verrall) . vii, 255
—— Poetical Works of, ed. by G. R. Noyes (G. C. Macaulay) . v, 233
Duclaux, M., The French Ideal (E. Fannière) . . . . . viii, 253
—— The French Procession (E. Fannière) . . . . . viii, 253
Duff, E. Gordon, The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557 (Charles Sayle) . . . . . vii, 545
Düntzer, H., The Life of Goethe, transl. by T. N. Lyster (J. G. R.) iv, 275
Duriez, G., La Théologie dans le Drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge (L. A. Triebel) . . . . . x, 120
—— Les Apocryphes dans le Drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge (L. A. Triebel) . . . . . x, 120
Dyboski, R., Tennysons Sprache und Stil (A. B. Young) . . . ii, 271

Efvergren, C., Names of Places in a Transferred Sense (A. C. Paues) IX, 410
Eichler, A., J. H. Frere; sein Leben und seine Werke (A. B. Young) . II, 271
Eliot, G., Romola (World's Classics) (G. C. M.) . . . . . X, 390
Elson, C., Wieland and Shaftesbury (J. G. Robertson) . . . IX, 424
Elton, O., Modern Studies (P. G. Thomas) . . . . . III, 297
—— A Survey of English Literature, 1780–1830 (A. A. Jack) . VIII, 235
Emerson, O. F., A Middle English Reader (H. Littledale) . . . I, 133
English Classical Tragedies, Early, ed. by J. W. Cunliffe (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VIII, 218
English Literature and the Classics, ed. by G. S. Gordon (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VIII, 387
English Lyrics, Early, chosen by E. K. Chambers and F. Sidgwick (W. P. Ker) . . . . . III, 395
English Parnassus, The, ed. by W. H. MacNeile Dixon and H. J. C. Grierson (F. W. M.) . . . . . VI, 558
Enterlude of Welth and Helth, An, herausg. von F. Holthausen (W. W. Greg) . . . . . IV, 115
Essays and Studies, collected by A. C. Bradley (English Association) (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VI, 533
Essays and Studies, collected by W. P. Ker (English Association) (Helen Darbishire) . . . . . VIII, 548
Euling, K., Das Priamel bis Hans Rosenplüt (R. Priebsch) . . . III, 189

Fairchild, A. H. R., The Making of Poetry (Grace E. Hadow) . . VIII, 213
Fansler, H. E., The Evolution of Technic in Elizabethan Tragedy (O. L. Hatcher) . . . . . X, 382
Farinelli, A., Dante e la Francia (P. F. Willert) . . . . . IV, 398
Farnsworth, W. O., Uncle and Nephew in the Old French Chansons de Geste (M. K. Pope) . . . . . IX, 278
Felder, F. M., Aus meinem Leben (J. G. Robertson) . . . . VIII, 407
Festschrift zur 49. Versammlung deutscher Philologen . . . III, 200
Feuillerat, A., Documents relating to the Office of the Revels (F. S. Boas) V, 510
—— John Lyly (J. Dover Wilson) . . . . . VI, 103
Figueiredo, F. de, Historia da Litteratura Portuguesa, 1825–70; 1871–1900 (A. F. G. Bell) . . . . . IX, 418
Finsler, G., Homer in der Neuzeit von Dante bis Goethe (R. Petsch) . VIII, 413
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., Cervantes in England (H. Oelsner) . . . I, 258
—— Chapters on Spanish Literature; Lecciones de Literatura Española (O. H. Fynes-Clinton) . . . . . V, 253
—— Littérature espagnole; Historia de la Literatura Española (H. A. Rennert) . . . . . IX, 275
—— Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (H. A. Rennert) . . . IX, 421
Flamini, F., Avviamento allo Studio della Divina Commedia (L. Ragg) I, 256
Fletcher, Giles and Phineas, The Poetical Works of, ed. by F. S. Boas (W. Lewis Jones) . . . . . V, 221
Folengo, T., Le Maccheronee. A cura di A. Luzio (C. Foligno) . . VII, 410
Folquet de Marseille, Le Troubadour, ed. par S. Stronski (H. J. Chaytor) VI, 549

Forerunners of Dante, The, ed. by A. J. Butler (E. G. Gardner) . VI, 547
Francis, St, and his Friars, The Little Flowers of, transl. by W. Heywood (L. Ragg) . . . . . II, 253
Franz, W., Orthographie, Lautgebung und Wortbildung in den Werken Shakespeares (Allen Mawer) . . . . . I, 342
—— Shakespeare-Grammatik (G. C. M. S.) . . . . . V, 260
Fraunce, A., Victoria: a Latin Comedy, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (Wolfgang Keller) . . . . . III, 177
French Poets, A Century of, ed. by F. Y. Eccles (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) VII, 130
Friedrich von Schwaben, herausg. von M. H. Jellinek (R. Priebsch) . I, 66
Frisian Literature (W. A. Craigie) . . . . . V, 382; VI, 280
Fucus Histriomastix, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (W. W. Greg) . . V, 356
Furnivall, Frederick James, A Volume of Personal Record (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VII, 262

Gabrielson, A., Influence of w- in Old English, as seen in the Middle English Dialects (A. M.) . . . . . IX, 133
—— Rime as a Criterion of Pronunciation (A. M.) . . . VI, 276
Gadde, F., On the Suffixes -ery, -age, and -ment in English (A. C. Paues) IX, 410
Gaehde, C., David Garrick als Shakespeare-Darsteller . . . . I, 76
Galt, J., The Entail (World's Classics) (G. C. M.) . . . . X, 390
Gardner, E. G., Dante and the Mystics (J. T. Mitchell) . . . VIII, 566
Gascoigne, G., The Complete Works, ed. by J. W. Cunliffe, I (G. C. M. S.) IV, 130
—— The Complete Works, II (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . VI, 414
Geiger, L., Goethe und die Seinen (Jessie Crosland) . . . . IV, 537
Genesis, The Later, ed. by F. Klaeber . . . . . IX, 282
Gildersleeve, V. C., Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama (W. W. G.) . . . . . VI, 559
Gillet, J. E., Molière en Angleterre, 1660–70 (J. J. Champenois) . IX, 127, 430
Gilm, H. von, Familien- und Freundesbriefe, herausg. von M. Necker (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407
Ginnell, D., Stendhal et l'Angleterre (J. J. Champenois) . . . VI, 419
Gioberti, V., Del Rinnovamento d' Italia, a cura di F. Nicolini (C. Foligno) . . . . . VII, 410
Goddard, H. C., Chaucer's Legend of Good Women (G. C. M.) . . VI, 136
Goer, Joan, Confision del Amante. Herausg. von A. Birch-Hirschfeld (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . V, 527
Goethe, J. W. von, Faust. Erster Teil, ed. by J. Goebel (A. R. Hohlfeld) III, 379
—— Faust, transl. by A. Swanwick, with Introduction by K. Breul I, 163
—— Gespräche, herausg. von F. von Biedermann (H. Mutschmann) VIII, 257
—— Der junge, ed. by S. Hirzel. Neue Ausgabe . . . . III, 305
—— Lyrische Gedichte, herausg. von R. M. Meyer (J. G. R.) . IV, 275
—— New editions of English Translations of (J. G. R.) . . IV, 275
—— Wilhelm Meister's Theatrical Mission, transl. by G. A. Page (J. Lees) . . . . . IX, 426
—— Werke, Volks-Ausgabe, herausg. von E. Schmidt . . . III, 305
—— West-Eastern Divan, transl. by E. Dowden (J. Lees) . . IX, 426

Golding, A., A Tragedie of Abraham's Sacrifice, ed. by M. W. Wallace (G. C. M. S.) . . . . . II, 281
Goldsmith, O., Complete Poetical Works (A. B. W.) . . . . II, 280
—— Plays, Together with the Vicar of Wakefield, ed. by C. E. Doble . . . . . V, 397
Goodall, A., Place-Names of South-West Yorkshire (Allen Mawer) . X, 106
Goodnight, S. H., German Literature in American Magazines, prior to 1846 (Margaret W. Cooke) . . . . . VI, 422
Gordon, A. L., Poems, ed. by F. M. Robb (Grace E. Hadow) . . VIII, 558
Gordon, G. S., English Literature and the Classics, collected by (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VIII, 387
Gospels of St John, St Matthew and St Mark in West-Saxon, ed. by J. W. Bright (R. W. Chambers) . . . . . I, 252
Gossouin, Maître, L'Image du Monde, éd. par H. O. Prior (A. Terracher) IX, 416
Gottfried von Strassburg, Tristan und Isolde, neu bearbeitet von W. Hertz (R. Petsch) . . . . . VII, 413
Grammont, M., Le Vers français (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) . . . IX, 549
Grandgent, C. H., An Introduction to Vulgar Latin (L. Brandin) . III, 298
—— An Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Old Provençal (H. J. Chaytor). . . . . I, 353
Grant, W., The Pronunciation of English in Scotland (H. Mutschmann) IX, 273
Grasserie, R. de la, Étude scientifique sur l'Argot (G. A. Parry) . IV, 544
Gray, C. H., Lodowick Carliell (G. C. M.) . . . . . VII, 567
Gray, T., Essays and Criticisms, ed. by C. S. Northup (J. W. H. Atkins) IX, 113
Greene, R., Plays, ed. by T. H. Dickinson (W. W. G.) . . . V, 394
—— The Plays and Poems of, ed. by J. C. Collins (W. W. Greg) I, 238
Greg, W. W., Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama (H. J. C. Grierson) IV, 110
—— Twelve Early English MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. . . . . IX, 560
Grendon, F., The Anglo-Saxon Charms (A. R. Skemp) . . . VI, 262
Grillparzer, F., Gespräche, herausg. von A. Sauer (J. G. Robertson) . VIII, 407
Grudzinski, H., Shaftesburys Einfluss auf Wieland (J. G. Robertson) IX, 424
Grün, A., Politische Reden und Schriften, herausg. von S. Hock (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407
Guischart de Beaulieu, Sermon de, ed. by A. Gabrielson (H. O.) . VI, 135
Gummere, F. B., The Popular Ballad (F. Sidgwick) . . . . III, 295
Gunnell, D., Stendhal et l'Angleterre (J. J. Champenois) . . . VI, 419
Guy, H., Histoire de la Poésie française au XVI^e^ siècle, I (A. Barbier) VII, 407

Haertel, M. H., German Literature in American Magazines, 1846–80 (Margaret W. Cooke) . . . . . VI, 422
Halifax, George Savile, Marquess of, Complete Works, ed. by W. Raleigh (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VIII, 229
Hall, H. M., Idylls of Fishermen (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . VIII, 392
Hamann, H., Die literarischen Vorlagen der Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm (T. Rea) . . . . . II, 372
Hammond, E. P., Chaucer: a Bibliographical Manual (G. C. Macaulay) IV, 526

Haney, J. L., The German Influence on S. T. Coleridge (J. Burne) . II, 86
Hare, C., Dante the Wayfarer (L. Ragg) . . . . . I, 255
Harper, C. A., The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene (G. C. M.) . . . . . VII, 279
Hart, J. M., The Development of Standard English Speech (J. H. G. G.) III, 199
Hatcher, O. L., John Fletcher (W. W. Greg) . . . . . II, 365
Haverford Essays (F. W. Moorman) . . . . . VI, 536
Hebrew-German Arthurian Legends, ed. by L. Landau (L. A. Willoughby) . . . . . IX, 558
Hedgcock, F. A., David Garrick et ses amis français (H. F. Stewart) VII, 387
—— Thomas Hardy (H. F. Stewart) . . . . . VII, 390
Heller, O., Studies in Modern German Literature (R. M. Meyer) . I, 348
Helmholtz, A. A., The Indebtedness of S. T. Coleridge to A. W. von Schlegel (O. Elton) . . . . . IV, 119
Henderson, T. F., The Ballad in Literature . . . . . IX, 131
Henslowe's Diary, ed. by W. W. Greg (E. K. Chambers) . . . IV, 407
Herbst, C., Cupid's Revenge by Beaumont and Fletcher, and Andromana (W. W. G.) . . . . . II, 374
Hertz, W., Gottfrieds von Strassburg Tristan und Isolde (R. Petsch) VI, 413
Hexaplar Psalter, The, ed. by W. A. Wright (G. C. Macaulay) . . VI, 248
Higginson, J. J., Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar in Relation to Contemporary Affairs (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . IX, 394
Hoare, A., An Italian Dictionary (P. R.) . . . . . X, 391
Hof, J. J., Yn eigen Tún (W. A. Craigie) . . . . . V, 382
Hoffmann, E. T. A., Sämtliche Werke, herausg. von C. G. von Maassen III, 305
Hollway-Calthrop, H. C., Petrarch (Paget Toynbee) . . . . III, 91
Homer's Odyssey, transl. by H. B. Cotterill (T. S. Omond) . . VII, 257
Howell, A. G. F., San Bernardino of Siena (J. T. Mitchell) . . IX, 423
Hubschmied, J. U., Zur Bildung des Imperfekts im Frankoprovenzalischen (E. H. Tuttle) . . . . . X, 246
Huchon, R., Un Poète réaliste anglais, George Crabbe; also in English translation by F. Clarke (A. Blyth Webster). . . . . III, 173
Hudson, W. H., An Introduction to the Study of Literature (J. W. H. Atkins) . . . . . VII, 396
Hugon, C., Social France in the Seventeenth Century (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) . . . . . VIII, 420
Hull, E., A Textbook of Irish Literature (E. C. Q.) . . . . II, 374
Hume, M., Spanish Influence on English Literature (H. Oelsner) . I, 351
Hurd, R., Letters on Chivalry and Romance, ed. by E. J. Morley (J. W. H. A.) . . . . . IX, 131
Huszár, G., Molière et l'Espagne (A. T.) . . . . . IV, 131
Hymenaeus, ed. G. C. Moore Smith (W. W. Greg) . . . . V, 356

Imelmann, R., Die altenglische Odoaker-Dichtung (H. Bradley) . . II, 365

Jack, A. A., Poetry and Prose (C. H. Herford) . . . . . VIII, 210
Jacoby, G., Herder als Faust (R. Petsch) . . . . . VII, 538

James I of England, New Poems by, ed. by A. F. Westcott (T. F. Henderson) . . . . . VIII, 115
Jansen, K., Die Cynewulf-Forschung (A. M.) . . . . . V, 396
Jeffrey's Literary Criticism, ed. by Nicol Smith (G. E. H.) . . VIII, 133
Jerrold, M. F., Francesco Petrarca (Paget Toynbee) . . . . V, 257
Jespersen, O., Elementarbuch der Phonetik (A. M.) . . . . VIII, 423
—— Engelsk Fonetik (A. M.) . . . . . VIII, 423
—— Growth and Structure of the English Language (A. Mawer). I, 234
—— —— Second edition (G. C. M.) . . . . . VIII, 133
—— Større Engelsk Grammatik, I; A Modern English Grammar, I (A. Mawer) . . . . . V, 244
Jewett, S., Folk-Ballads of Southern Europe (A. F. G. Bell) . . IX, 419
Joachimi, M., Die Weltanschauung der deutschen Romantik (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . II, 273
Johannson, A., Phonetics of the New High German Language (R. A. Williams) . . . . . I, 345
Johnston, Sir H., Phonetic Spelling (H. Alexander) . . . . IX, 427
Jones, Henry, Tennyson (G. E. Hadow) . . . . . V, 530
Jones, J. Morris, A Welsh Grammar (E. C. Quiggin) . . . . IX, 281
Jonson, Ben, Bartholomew Fair, ed. by C. S. Alden (W. W. Greg) . I, 137
—— Cynthia's Revels, ed. by A. C. Judson (W. W. Greg) . . IX, 259
—— Eastward Hoe and the Alchemist, ed. by F. E. Schelling (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 137
—— Every Man out of his Humor, ed. by W. Bang and W. W. Greg (G. Gregory Smith) . . . . . II, 360
—— The New Inn, ed. by G. B. Tennant (W. W. Greg) . . IV, 413
—— The Poetaster, ed. by H. S. Mallory (W. W. Greg) . . I, 137
—— The Sad Shepherd, ed. by W. W. Greg (G. Gregory Smith) II, 360
—— The Staple of News, ed. by De Winter (W. W. Greg) . . I, 137
—— Underwoods (P. Simpson). . . . . I, 251
Jost, K., Beon und Wesan (P. G. Thomas) . . . . . VII, 268
Jourdain, E. F., An Introduction to the French Classical Drama (H. Chatelain) . . . . . VIII, 561
Journal of English and Germanic Philology, The . . . . III, 408
Jugé, C., Jacques Peletier du Mans (F. Gohin) . . . . . IV, 269
Junius-Psalter, Der altenglische, herausg. von E. Brenner (A. O. Belfour) V, 531

Kaluza, M., A Short History of English Versification, transl. by A. C. Dunstan (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . . . VII, 123
Kaulfuss-Diesch, C. H., Die Inszenierung des deutschen Dramas an der Wende des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts (M. Blakemore Evans). IV, 531
Keats, J., The Poems of, ed. by E. de Sélincourt (A. R. Waller) . I, 148
—— Poetical Works, ed. by H. Buxton Forman (A. R. Waller) III, 85
Keble's Lectures on Poetry, transl. by E. K. Francis (G. C. Macaulay) VIII, 553
Kellett, E. E., A Book of Cambridge Verse (G. C. Moore Smith) . VI, 538
Kellum, M. D., The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to St Luke (P. G. Thomas) . . . . . II, 70

Ker, W. P., Essays on Medieval Literature . . . . . I, 161
—— Tennyson (G. E. Hadow) . . . . . V, 530
Keynes, G., Bibliography of the Works of Dr John Donne (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . X, 385
Kind, J. L., Edward Young in Germany (J. Crosland) . . . II, 369
King Leir, The Chronicle History of, ed. by S. Lee (W. W. Greg) . V, 515
Kingis Quair, The, and The Quare of Jelusy, ed. by A. Lawson (W. W. Skeat) . . . . . VI, 412
Klein, D., Literary Criticism from the Elizabethan Dramatists (J. W. H. Atkins) . . . . . VII, 251
Kluge, F., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (H. Mutschmann) . . . . . VI, 273
Klump, W., Die altenglischen Handwerkernamen (A. Mawer) . . V, 381
Koch, M., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur (H. G. A.) . . . I, 355
Koeppel, E., Shakespeares Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 137
Koszul, A., La Jeunesse de Shelley (A. M. D. Hughes) . . . VII, 383
Kuh, E., Literarische Aufsätze, herausg. von A. Schaer (J. G. Robertson) VIII, 407
Kürnberger, F., Briefe an eine Freundin, herausg. von O. E. Deutsch (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407

Laelia, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (W. W. Greg) . . . . . VI, 528
Lafenestre, G., Molière (A. Tilley) . . . . . V, 126
Lancaster, H. C., Pierre Du Ryer (A. T.) . . . . . IX, 285
Langlois, E., Table des Noms propres dans les Chansons de Geste (Raymond Weeks) . . . . . III, 82
Lannert, G. L., The Language of 'Robinson Crusoe' (A. C. Paues) . IX, 410
Laube, H., Sämtliche Werke . . . . . III, 305
Laumonier, P., Ronsard, poète lyrique (A. Tilley) . . . . . VI, 268
—— Tableau chronologique des Oeuvres de Ronsard (A. Tilley) . VI, 268
Lazarillo de Tormes, The Life of, transl. by Sir C. Markham (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . . . IV, 258
Le Breton, A., Balzac, l'homme et l'oeuvre . . . . . I, 76
Lectura Dantis Genovese (L. R.) . . . . . II, 274
Lee, Sir S., The French Renaissance in England (L. E. Kastner) . VI, 246
—— Shakespeare and the Modern Stage (F. S. Boas) . . . II, 353
Leeb-Lundberg, W., Word-Formation in Kipling (A. C. Paues) . . IX, 410
Lees, J., The German Lyric (F. E. Sandbach) . . . . . X, 255
Lefranc, A., Grands Écrivains français de la Renaissance (A. Tilley) . IX, 543
Legouis, E., Chaucer (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . VI, 532
Lemaitre, J., Jean Racine (H. F. Stewart) . . . . . IV, 546
Lessing, O. E., Masters in Modern German Literature (J. G. R.) . VIII, 276
Lewes, G. H., The Life of Goethe, ed. by H. Ellis (J. G. R.) . . IV, 276
Lewis, C. B., La Lyre d'Amour (A. Barbier) . . . . . VII, 406
Lewis, C. M., The Principles of English Verse (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) II, 261
Libro de los engaños y los asayamientos de las mugeres, publ. A. Bonilla y San Martín (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . . . II, 257

Lindelöf, U. L., Grundzüge der Geschichte der englischen Sprache (A. M.) VIII, 422
Lirici Marinisti, a cura di B. Croce (C. Foligno) . . . . . VII, 410
Lirondelle, A., Le Poète Alexis Tolstoï (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . VIII, 416
Lloyd, R. J., Northern English (A. M.) . . . . . II, 272
Lochmer, A., English-Croatian Dictionary (W. R. M.) . . . . II, 193
Loewe, R., Germanic Philology, transl. by J. D. Jones (R. A. Williams) VIII, 412
Logeman, H., Tenuis en Media (R. A. Williams) . . . . IV, 553
Lounsbury, T. R., The First Editors of Shakespeare (A. R. Waller) . II, 265
Lowell, J. R., Poems . . . . . IX, 132
Luquiens, F. B., An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology (M. K. Pope) . . . . . VIII, 248
Lydgate, J., The Serpent of Division, ed. by H. N. MacCracken (J. W. H. Atkins) . . . . . VII, 253
Lyrical Ballads (G. C. M.) . . . . . VII, 423

MacCallum, M. W., Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background (F. S. Boas) . . . . . VII, 110
MacDonagh, T., Thomas Campion and the Art of English Poetry (R. M. Alden) . . . . . X, 231
Mackail, J. W., The Springs of Helicon (O. Elton) . . . . . V, 114
McKenzie, K., Concordanza delle Rime di F. Petrarca (Paget Toynbee) VIII, 262
Magnus, L., Documents illustrating Elizabethan Poetry (F. W. M.) . II, 191
—— English Literature in the Nineteenth Century (G. E. Hadow) V, 376
Mahn, P., Guy de Maupassant (R. M. Meyer) . . . . . IV, 548
Mairet, La Sylvie du Sieur, publ. par J. Marsan (A. Tilley) . . II, 261
Malone Society, The . . . . . II, 90; III, 304; V, 134
Malory's Book of Merlin and Book of Sir Balin, ed. by C. G. Child (J. H. G. G.) . . . . . III, 303
Manzoni, A., Carteggio di, a cura di G. Sforza e G. Gallavresi (C. F.) VIII, 134
Marcabru, Poésies du Troubadour, éd. par J. M. L. Dejeanne (H. J. Chaytor) . . . . . VI, 549
Marlowe, C., Works, ed. by C. F. Tucker Brooke (G. C. M.) . . VI, 137
Marsan, J., La Pastorale dramatique en France (W. W. Greg) . . II, 83
Martens, K., Literatur in Deutschland (K. Holl) . . . . . VII, 416
Martino, P., Le Roman réaliste sous le Second Empire (A. Tilley) . . IX, 412
Massinger, P., A New Way to Pay Old Debts, ed. by G. Stronach (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 136
Masterpieces of the English Drama, ed. by F. E. Schelling (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . IX, 111
Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas, herausg. von W. Bang, Vols. VI, IX (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 136
—— Vols. XI, XVI, XVII (G. Gregory Smith) . . . . . II, 360
—— Vol. XIII (W. W. Greg) . . . . . III, 292
—— Vol. XIV (Wolfgang Keller) . . . . . III, 177
—— Vol. XVIII (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . II, 361
Matthews, B., Molière, his Life and his Works (H. Chatelain) . . VI, 556
Medicina de Quadrupedibus, ed. by J. Delcourt . . . . . X, 128

Melchior, F., Heines Verhältnis zu Lord Byron (J. Lees) . . . I, 152
Melton, W. F., The Rhetoric of John Donne's Verse (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . III, 80
Menéndez Pidal, R., El Romancero Español (W. P. Ker) . . . VIII, 264
Menéndez y Pelayo, M., Orígenes de la Novela, I, II (H. A. Rennert) II, 168 ; IV, 422
Menzio, P. A., Il traviamento intellettuale di Dante (L. R.) . . . II, 192
Meredith, G., The Poetical Works of, ed. by G. M. Trevelyan (H. Darbishire) . . . . . X, 115
Michaelis, H., and Jones, D., Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language (H. C. Wyld) . . . . . IX, 107
Middle English Humorous Tales in Verse, ed. by G. H. McKnight (J. W. H. Atkins) . . . . . X, 237
Milton's Paradise Lost, ed. by A. W. Verity (G. E. Hadow) . . VI, 259
Mindesmærker af Danmarks Nationallitteratur . . . . . IV, 132
Mira de Mesqua, Comedia famosa del Esclavo del Demonio, ed. by M. A. Buchanan (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . . . II, 82
Mittelhochdeutsche Erzählungen, Kleinere, herausg. von A. Leitzmann (R. Priebsch) . . . . . I, 66
Molière Collection in Harvard College, Catalogue of the . . . I, 355
Möller, B. P., Söl'ring Leesbok (W. A. Craigie) . . . . . V, 382
Montaigne's Essais, Phototype Reproduction of . . . . . III, 305
Moore, E. H., English Miracle Plays and Moralities (W. W. Greg) . . III, 396
Moorman, F. W., The Interpretation of Nature in English Poetry (C. H. Herford) . . . . . II, 179
—— Robert Herrick (F. S. Boas) . . . . . VII, 381
—— West Riding Place-Names (A. Mawer) . . . . . VII, 264
Morellini, D., Giovanna d' Aragona, Duchessa d' Amalfi (W. W. Greg) . II, 373
Morgan, C. E., The Rise of the Novel of Manners . . . . VIII, 274
Müller, E., Englische Lautlehre nach James Elphinston (H. C. Wyld) X, 109
Müller, F. Max, The German Classics from the 4th to the 19th Century (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . I, 349
Mutschmann, H., The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire (W. J. Sedgefield) IX, 405

Nashe, Thomas, The Works of, ed. by R. B. McKerrow (H. V. Routh) . VI, 241
Nativity Plays, English, ed. by S. B. Hemingway (E. K. Chambers) . VII, 546
Naumann, H., Altnordische Namenstudien (A. Mawer) . . . VIII, 246
New English Dictionary, ed. by J. A. H. Murray (Prophesy—Pyxis) (W. W. Skeat) . . . . . V, 241
Nibelung Men, The Lay of the, transl. by A. S. Way (F. E. Sandbach) VII, 540
Nicholson, F. C., Old German Love-Songs, transl. by (F. E. Sandbach) II, 277
Noyes, E., The Casentino and its Story (L. Ragg) . . . . I, 351
Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles (H. A. Rennert) . . II, 168 ; IV, 422
Nyrop, K., Grammaire historique de la langue française, III (A. T. Baker) IV, 542

Ochsenbein, W., Die Aufnahme Lord Byrons in Deutschland (J. Lees) . I, 152
Oldest Monuments of the French Language, The, translated (E. G. R. Waters) . . . . . VIII, 251

Omond, T. S., English Metrists in the 18th and 19th Centuries (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) . . . . . III, 181
Onions, C. T., A Shakespeare Glossary (G. C. Macaulay) . . . VII, 559
Oswald, E., The Legend of Fair Helen (H. G. A.) . . . . I, 354
Oxford Book of Ballads, The, chosen by A. Quiller-Couch (F. Sidgwick) VI, 260
—— Book of French Verse, The, chosen by St John Lucas (A. Tilley) . . . . . IV, 102
—— Book of Italian Verse, The, chosen by St John Lucas (C. Foligno) . . . . . VI, 415
—— Book of Victorian Verse, The, chosen by A. Quiller-Couch (G. E. Hadow) . . . . . IX, 115
Oxforder Buch deutscher Dichtung, Das, herausg. von H. G. Fiedler (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VII, 414

Padelford, F. M., Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics (F. Sidgwick) . III, 294
Palm, B., The Place of the Adjective Attribute in English Prose (A. C. Paues) . . . . . IX, 410
Panzer, F., Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte, I. Beowulf (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . . . VI, 128
Paoli, B., Gesammelte Aufsätze, herausg. von H. Bettelheim-Gabillon (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407
Paris, G., Histoire poétique de Charlemagne (R. Weeks) . . . I, 353
Partiall Law, The, ed. by B. Dobell (W. W. Greg) . . . . IV, 118
Pathelin, The Farce of Master Pierre, Englished by R. Holbrook (E. K. Chambers) . . . . . II, 85
Patience, ed. by Hartley Bateson (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . VIII, 396
—— ed. by I. Gollancz (J. H. G. Grattan) . . . . . IX, 403
Patterson, F. A., The Middle English Penitential Lyric (Carleton Brown) VIII, 215
Peacock's Memoirs of Shelley, with Shelley's Letters to Peacock, ed. by H. F. B. Brett-Smith (G. E. Hadow) . . . . . V, 529
Pearl, The, transl. by C. G. Osgood (A. M.) . . . . . IV, 132
Pedantius, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (F. S. Boas) . . . . I, 235
Peele, G., The Arraignment of Paris, ed. by O. Smeaton (W. W. Greg) I, 136
Pellisson, M., Les Comédies-Ballets de Molière (A. Tilley) . . . IX, 548
Pepys, S., The Diary of, ed. by G. Gregory Smith . . . . I, 162
Perrett, W., The Story of King Lear from Gregory of Monmouth to Shakespeare (F. W. Moorman) . . . . . I, 69
Petit, L. D., Bibliographie der Middelnederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde, II (R. Priebsch) . . . . . VII, 277
Phoenix, Die altenglische Dichtung, herausg. von O. Schlotterose (A. M.) V, 396
Photiadès, C., George Meredith, transl. by A. Price (A. R. Skemp) . . X, 236
Pierce the Ploughmans Crede, ed. by W. W. Skeat (R. W. C.) . . II, 190
Pierquin, H., Le poème anglo-saxon de Beowulf (W. J. Sedgefield) . . VIII, 550
Plattard, J., L'Oeuvre de Rabelais (A. Tilley) . . . . . V, 536
Plautus, Menaechmi, transl. by W. Warner, ed. by W. H. D. Rouse . VIII, 273
Plays from the Italian, Early, ed. by R. Warwick Bond (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VI, 524

Poetry of the Age of Shakespeare, Anthology of the, chosen by W. T. Young (G. E. Hadow) . . . . . VI, 530
Pollard, A. W., English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes, 5th ed. V, 397
Pollard, P., Masks and Minstrels of New Germany (K. Holl) . . VII, 416
Polo, Marco, Il Milione, a cura di D. Olivieri (C. Foligno) . . . VIII, 267
Porterfield, A. W., K. L. Immermann (J. G. R.) . . . . . VIII, 276
Postma, G., and Clercq, P. de, Lytse Fryske Spraekleare (W. A. Craigie) V, 382
Pound, E., The Spirit of Romance (W. P. Ker) . . . . . VII, 127
Predicadores de los Siglos XVI y XVII, I, ed. by M. Mir (H. A. Rennert) . II, 168
Prestage, E., D. Francisco Manuel de Mello (A. F. G. Bell) . . . X, 119
Price, H. T., History of Ablaut in the English Strong Verbs . . . VI, 277
Primitiae, by Students of the University of Liverpool (N. Hepple) . . IX, 536
Prior, M., The Writings of, ed. by A. R. Waller, I (G. Gregory Smith) . I, 343
Psalter, Der Cambridger, herausg. von K. Wildhagen, I (A. O. Belfour) . VII, 557
Purser, W. E., Palmerin of England (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . . II, 79
Puyol y Alonso, J., El Arcipreste de Hita (J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) . . II, 258

Queen, The, or The Excellency of her Sex, herausg. von W. Bang (W. W. Greg) . . . . . III, 292

Rabelais, F., Lettres écrites d'Italie, éd. par Bourilly (A. T.) . . VI, 134
Rand, E. K., and Wilkins, E. H., Dantis Alagherii Operum Latinorum Concordantiae (Paget Toynbee) . . . . . VIII, 262
Rea, T., Schiller's Dramas and Poems in England (J. G. R.) . . II, 192
Recluse, The, ed. by J. Påhlsson (A. M.) . . . . . VIII, 133
Reed, E. B., English Lyrical Poetry (N. Hepple) . . . . . VIII, 389
Regel für ein vollkommenes Leben, Die heilige, herausg. von R. Priebsch (G. Schaaffs) . . . . . V, 388
Return from Parnassus, The, ed. by O. Smeaton (W. W. Greg) . . I, 136
Reyher, P., Les Masques anglais (W. W. Greg) . . . . . VI, 529
Reynolds, M., Nature in English Poetry between Pope and Wordsworth (F. W. Moorman) . . . . . IX, 110
Rich, Barnabe, Apolonius and Silla, ed. by Morton Luce (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VII, 552
Richier, La Vie de St Rémi, ed. by W. N. Bolderston (P. Barbier fils) . IX, 117
Richter, H., George Eliot (A. B. Y.) . . . . . III, 304
Riddles of the Exeter Book, The, ed. by F. Tupper (R. W. Chambers) . IX, 271
Riddles, Old English, ed. by A. J. Wyatt (A. R. Skemp) . . . IX, 400
Rigal, E., Molière (A. Tilley) . . . . . V, 126
Ritchie, R. L. G., and Moore, J. M., Manual of French Composition . X, 391
Roberts, R. G., The Place-Names of Sussex (W. J. Sedgefield) . . X, 238
Robertson, J. M., The Baconian Heresy: a Confutation (J. Dover Wilson) IX, 527
—— Did Shakespeare write 'Titus Andronicus'? (W. W. Greg) . I, 337
—— Montaigne and Shakespeare, and other Essays (R. Warwick Bond) . . . . . V, 361
Rossetti, D. G., Poems and Translations . . . . . IX, 283
Rossetti, W. M., Dante and his Convito (L. Ragg) . . . . VI, 134

Rothschild, J. A. de, Shakespeare and his Day (F. S. Boas) . . II, 353
Rouge, I., Erläuterungen zu F. Schlegels 'Lucinde' (J. G. Robertson) II, 273
—— F. Schlegel et la Genèse du Romantisme allemand (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . II, 273
Rowley, W., 'All's Lost by Lust' and 'A Shoemaker a Gentleman,' ed. by C. W. Stork (R. B. McKerrow) . . . . . VII, 548
Roy, É., Études sur le Théâtre français du XIVe et du XVe siècle (L. B.) . II, 375
—— Le Jour du Jugement (L. B.) . . . . . II, 375
Rudmose-Brown, T. B., Étude comparée de la Versification française et anglaise (W. W. G.) . . . . . II, 189
Runtz-Rees, C., Charles de Sainte-Marthe (H. Chatelain) . . . VIII, 132
Russell-Smith, H. F., Harrington and his 'Oceana' . . . . X, 127

Saintsbury, G., A History of English Prosody, I (R. B. McKerrow) . II, 65
—— —— Vols. II, III (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . V, 227, 521
—— Historical Manual of English Prosody (G. C. Macaulay) . VII, 542
Salusbury, Sir J., and Chester, R., Poems, ed. by Carleton Brown (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . IX, 533
Salimbene, From St Francis to Dante, transl. by G. G. Coulton (L. Ragg) II, 253
Sanders, D., und Wülfing, J. E., Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (H. Mutschmann) . . . . . VI, 274
Sannazaro, J., Piscatory Eclogues, ed. by W. P. Mustard (C. Foligno) X, 248
Scaranno, N., Saggi danteschi (L. R.) . . . . . II, 192
Scartazzini, G. A., Dantologia, 3a ed. (L. Ragg) . . . . . I, 256
Schalfejew, P., Die volkstümliche Dichtung A. Kol'covs (W. J. S.) . VII, 135
Schelling, F. E., Elizabethan Drama, 1538–1642 (W. W. Greg) . . V, 211
Schenck, E. M., Ch. Nodier et les Idées romantiques de Victor Hugo (A. Barbier) . . . . . X, 242
Scherer, W., A History of German Literature, transl. by Mrs F. C. Conybeare (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . I, 349
Schick, J., Corpus Hamleticum, I (G. C. M. S.) . . . . . VIII, 569
Schillers Sämtliche Werke, Säkular-Ausgabe (J. G. Robertson) . . I, 150
Schipper, J., Beiträge und Studien zur englischen Kultur- und Literaturgeschichte (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . IV, 125
—— A History of English Versification (G. C. Macaulay) . . VII, 391
Schlegel, A. W. und F., Das Athenaeum, herausg. von F. Baader (R. M. Meyer) . . . . . I, 154
Schlegel, F., Briefe an Christine von Stransky, herausg. von M. Rottmanner (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407
—— Prosaische Jugendschriften, ed. by J. Minor (J. G. Robertson) . II, 273
Schmidt, J. E., Shakespeares Dramen und sein Schauspielerberuf (O. L. Hatcher) . . . . . X, 228
Scholl, J. W., F. Schlegel und Goethe (J. G. Robertson) . . . II, 273
Schrötter, W., Ovid und die Troubadours (H. J. Chaytor) . . . IV, 427
Schück, H., Folknamnet Geatas i den fornengelska dikten Beowulf (A. M.) IV, 273
Scrittori d' Italia (H. O.) . . . . . VI, 135
—— Vols. I, X, XII, XIV, XVI, XIX, XXIV (C. Foligno) . . . VII, 410

Scrittori d' Italia, Vols. II, V, IX, XVII, XVIII, XXIII, XXVI, XXVII, XXX (C. Foligno) . . . . . VIII, 267
Seneca, The Tragedies of, transl. by F. J. Miller (G. M. Spearing) . VII, 246
Serner, G., The Language of Swinburne's Lyrics and Epics (A. C. Paues) IX, 410
Serrano y Sanz, M., Autobiografías y Memorias (H. A. Rennert) . II, 168
Seydel, P., Experimentelle Versuche über die labialen Verschlusslaute (R. A. Williams) . . . . . IV, 553
Shakespeare, W., Complete Works, ed. by C. Porter and H. A. Clarke (G. Gregory Smith) . . . . . II, 358
—— Dzieta Dramatyzne, ed. by R. Dyboski . . . . . IX, 134
—— Macbeth, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson (G. C. Moore Smith) . X, 383
—— The Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602, ed. by W. W. Greg (E. K. Chambers) . . . . . VII, 547
—— Othello in Paralleldruck, ed. by A. Schröer (G. C. M.) . . V, 395
—— Sonnets and a Lover's Complaint, ed. by W. H. Hadow (W. W. G.) . . . . . IV, 130
—— The Winter's Tale, ed. by F. W. Moorman (F. W. Clarke) . VIII, 222
—— Apocrypha, The, ed. by C. F. Tucker-Brooke (F. W. Moorman) V, 119
—— in Hungarian (A. B. Y.) . . . . . III, 200
——'s Plutarch, ed. by C. F. Tucker-Brooke (G. C. Moore Smith) . V, 520
Sheavin, P., The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age (O. L. Hatcher) . . . . . VI, 118
Sheldon, E. S. and White, A. C., Concordanza delle Opere italiane in prosa e del Canzoniere di Dante Alighieri (P. Toynbee) . . I, 155
Shirburn Ballads, The (1585-1616), ed. by A. Clark (A. E. H. Swaen) . III, 76
Sipma, P., Frysk Lês- en Taelboekje (W. A. Craigie) . . . . V, 382
Skeat, W. W., The Eight-text Edition of the Canterbury Tales (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . V, 246
—— An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language (A. Mawer) (G. C. M.) . . . . . VI, 131
—— Concise Etymological Dictionary (G. C. M.) . . . . VI, 558
—— The Science of Etymology (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . . VIII, 394
Smith, C. A., Studies in English Syntax (J. H. G. G.) . . . III, 199
Smith, Wentworth, The Hector of Germanie, ed. by L. W. Payne (W. W. Greg) . . . . . III, 293
Smith, Winifred, The Commedia dell' Arte (C. Foligno) . . . VIII, 563
Smithson, G. A., The Old English Christian Epic (A. R. Skemp) . . VII, 379
Snell, F. J., The Age of Transition (J. H. G. G.) . . . . . II, 190
Soames, L., Introduction to English, French and German Phonetics (H. M.) IX, 284
—— The Teacher's Manual (H. M.) . . . . . IX, 284
Société des Textes français modernes . . . . . I, 78
Soergel, A., Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit (K. Holl) . . . VII, 416
Spenser, E., The Faerie Queene, ed. by J. C. Smith (G. C. Macaulay) V, 370
—— Minor Poems, ed. by E. de Sélincourt (G. C. Macaulay) . . VII, 114
—— Complete Poetical Works, ed. by R. E. Neil Dodge (P. W. Long) IV, 529
—— Poetical Works, ed. by J. C. Smith and E. de Sélincourt (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . X, 111

Spingarn, J. E., La Critica letteraria nel Rinascimento . . . I, 75
—— Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century (G. C. M. S.) . IV, 271
Squyr of Lowe Degre, The, ed. by W. E. Mead (F. Sidgwick) . . . I, 72
Stewart, H. F., and Tilley, A., The Romantic Movement in French Literature (H. E. Berthon) . . . . . VII, 269
Stjerna, K., Essays on Beowulf, transl. by J. R. Clark Hall (A. Mawer) . VIII, 242
Stoll, E. E., John Webster (W. W. Greg) . . . . . II, 73
Strachey, G. L., Landmarks in French Literature (A. Tilley) . . . VII, 397
Strowski, F., Tableau de la littérature française au XIX^e siècle (A. Tilley) VIII, 398
Studi di Filologia moderna . . . . . III, 200
Suchier, H., Les voyelles toniques du vieux français (L. B.) . . . II, 376
Suckling, Sir John, Works, ed. by A. H. Thompson (F. W. Moorman) . VI, 123
Suddard, M., Studies and Essays (G. E. Hadow) . . . . . VIII, 227
Symons, A., The Romantic Movement in English Poetry (L. Winstanley) V, 234

Tamassia, N., S. Francesco e la sua Leggenda (L. Ragg) . . . . II, 253
Tarozzi, G., Teologia Dantesca studiata nel Paradiso (L. Ragg) . . I, 256
Tatlock, J. S. P., The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works (G. C. Macaulay) . . . . . IV, 418
Thayer, H. W., Laurence Sterne in Germany (K. Breul) . . . II, 186
Theresa, St, Las Moradas (J. F.-K.) . . . . . VI, 278
Thomas, A., Nouveaux Essais de Philologie française (L. Brandin) . I, 253, 356
Thomas, A. B., Moore en France (J. Champenois) . . . . VII, 272
Thomas, E. J., Danish Conversation-Grammar (A. Mawer) . . VII, 134
Thomas, L. P., Le Lyrisme et la Préciosité cultistes en Espagne (M. A. Buchanan) . . . . . IV, 551
Thomas of Celano, Lives of St Francis, transl. by A. G. Ferrers Howell (L. R.) . . . . . III, 407
Thompson, E. N. S., The Controversy between The Puritans and the Stage (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 137
—— The English Moral Plays (E. K. Chambers) . . . . VIII, 121
Thumb, A., Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular (E. A. Gardner) VIII, 419
Thürnau, C., Die Geister in der englischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts (A. B. Young) . . . . . II, 368
Tilley, A., François Rabelais (H. Clouzot) . . . . . III, 403
—— From Montaigne to Molière (H. E. Berthon) . . . . V, 248
Tirso de Molina, Comedias, ed. by E. Cotarelo y Mori, I, II (H. A. Rennert) . . . . . II, 168; IV, 422
—— Obras, I (J. F.-K.) . . . . . VI, 278
Toynbee, P., Dante in English Literature, c. 1380–1844 (L. Ragg) . V, 534
—— In the Footprints of Dante (L. R.) . . . . . III, 303
Traherne, T., Poems of Felicity, ed. by H. I. Bell (W. Lewis Jones) VII, 555
Trobador Poets, transl. by Barbara Smythe (H. J. Chaytor) . . VI, 549
Turquet-Milnes, G., The Influence of Baudelaire in France and England (K. M. Linton and T. B. Rudmose-Brown) . . . . . IX, 122

Unger, R., Hamann und die Aufklärung (J. G. Robertson) . . VIII, 405

Upham, A. H., The French Influence in English Literature (L. E. Kastner) . . . . . IV, 549

Vaughan, C. E., Types of Tragic Drama (J. G. Robertson) . . III, 401
Verrier, P., Principes de la Métrique anglaise (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) VI, 230
Vicente, Gil, Auto da Festa (E. Prestage) . . . . . III, 88
Viëtor, W., A Shakespeare Phonology (F. J. Curtis) . . . . II, 74
Viglione, F., Ugo Foscolo in Inghilterra (C. Foligno) . . . . VII, 132
Villani's Chronicle, transl. by R. E. Selfe (L. Ragg) . . . . III, 182
Villey, P., Les sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne (A. Tilley) . . . . . IV, 401
Vittorelli, I., Poesie, a cura di A. Simioni (C. Foligno) . . . VII, 410
Vondrák, W., Vergleichende slavische Grammatik (W. R. M.) . . II, 193

Walch, G., Anthologie des Poètes français contemporains (F. Gohin) III, 86
Walker, H., The Literature of the Victorian Era (H. Darbishire) . VI, 124
Wallace, C. W., The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars (E. K. Chambers) . . . . . V, 224
Walter, E., A. F. Graf von Schack als Übersetzer (J. G. R.) . . III, 408
Ward, Sir A. W. and Waller, A. R., The Cambridge History of English Literature. *See* Cambridge History of English Literature
Waterhouse, G., The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century (L. A. Willoughby) . . . . . X, 122
Webster, J., The White Devil and the Duchess of Malfy, ed. by M. W. Sampson (W. W. Greg) . . . . . I, 137
Weightman, J., The Language and Dialect of the Later Old English Poetry (A. M.) . . . . . IV, 272
Wieland, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften . . . . . III, 305
Wien, Schriften des literarischen Vereins in (J. G. Robertson) I, 164; VIII, 407
Wiener Haupt- und Staatsaktionen, herausg. von R. Payer von Thurn (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . VIII, 407
Wiese, B., Altitalienisches Elementarbuch (A. J. Butler) . . . II, 256
Williams, J., Dante as a Jurist (L. R.). . . . . IV, 131
Williams, O. T., Short Extracts from Old English Poetry (A. M.) . V, 261
Williams, W. H., Specimens of Elizabethan Drama (W. W. Greg) . I, 136, 356
Wilson, A., The Swisser, publié par A. Feuillerat (W. W. Greg) . I, 137
Wilson, J. Dover, John Lyly (A. Feuillerat) . . . . . I, 330
—— Life in Shakespeare's England: a Book of Elizabethan Prose (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VII, 249
Wilson, L. R., Chaucer's Relative Constructions (A. M.) . . . IV, 273
Winther, F., Das gerettete Venedig . . . . . IX, 561
Witkop, P., Die neuere deutsche Lyrik (John Lees) . . . . VIII, 560
Witkowski, G., Die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur seit 1830 (K. Holl) . . . . . VII, 416
Wolff, S. L., The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction (G. C. Moore Smith) . . . . . VII, 550
Wolter, E., Lietuviška Chrestomatija, II . . . . . I, 163

Wood, A. I. P., The Stage History of Shakespeare's Richard III (G. C. M. S.) . . . . . v, 260
Woodbridge, E., Studies in Jonson's Comedy (W. W. Greg) . . i, 137
Wordsworth, W., Literary Criticism, ed. by N. C. Smith . . . i, 162
—— and Coleridge, S. T., Lyrical Ballads (G. C. M.) . . . vii, 423
—— Poems and Extracts, chosen by . . . . . i, 162
Worke for Cutlers, ed. by A. F. Sieveking (W. W. Greg) . . . i, 136
Worp, J. A., Geschiedenis van het Drama en van het Tooneel in Nederland (J. G. Robertson) . . . . . iii, 301
Wright, C. H. C., A History of French Literature (A. Tilley and H. Oelsner) . . . . . viii, 121, 277
Wright, E. H., The Authorship of 'Timon of Athens' (R. C. Brooke) vi, 257
Wright, J., Grammar of the Gothic Language (J. Steppat) . . . vi, 272
—— Historical German Grammar, i (J. Steppat) . . . . iii, 299
—— An Old High German Primer (J. Steppat) . . . . iii, 299
Wyld, H. C., The Growth of English (J. W. H. Atkins) . . . v, 377
—— The Historical Study of the Mother Tongue (J. W. H. Atkins) . v, 377
—— A Short History of English (A. Mawer) . . . . . x, 385
—— and Hirst, T. Oakes, Place-Names of Lancashire (W. W. Skeat) vi, 543
Wyndham, G., Ronsard and La Pléiade (A. Tilley) . . . . ii, 260
Wyneken, F. A., Rousseaus Einfluss auf Klinger . . . . . viii, 276

Zachrisson, R. E., Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-Names (W. W. Skeat) . . . . . v, 120
Zeitlin, J., The Accusative with Infinitive in English (A. Mawer) . v, 380
Zoega, G. T., Concise Dictionary of Icelandic (H. B. G.) . . . vi, 278

New Publications. i, 79, 165, 262, 357; ii, 91, 194, 282, 378; iii, 98, 201, 306, 409; iv, 133, 277, 564; v, 135, 263, 399, 540; vi, 138, 281, 425, 561; vii, 137, 280, 425, 568; viii, 135, 278, 424, 570; ix, 136, 287, 432, 562; x, 258.

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BINDING DEPT. AUG 4 1979

PB
1
M65
v.10

The Modern language review

66

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY